

# AMERICA

## A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. L. No. 17  
WHOLE No. 1270

January 27, 1934

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| <b>EDITORIALS</b> —Notes .....  | 389-393 |
| <b>TOPICS OF INTEREST:</b> Catholic Art in Europe by Herbert G. Kramer, S.M.—A<br>New Food and Drugs Act by Floyd Anderson—Poor Lady More! by Theodore<br>Maynard—The Pastor and Pseudo-Invalids by Will W. Whalen..... | 394-400 |
| <b>EDUCATION:</b> Is Catholic Education "Overdone"? by Paul L. Blakely, S.J.....  | 400-401 |
| <b>SOCIOLOGY:</b> Washington Welshes on Wages by John Wiltbye.....  | 401-403 |
| <b>WITH SCRIP AND STAFF</b> by The Pilgrim.....   | 403-404 |
| <b>DRAMATICS:</b> The New Plays by Elizabeth Jordan .....   | 404-406 |
| <b>REVIEWS OF BOOKS</b> ..406-408.. <b>COMMUNICATIONS</b> ..408-409.. <b>CHRONICLE</b> ...  | 410-412 |

### A New Era in Government

SOME weeks ago an old man was arraigned before a Federal Court in New York. The charge to which he pleaded was the possession of \$6,000 in gold coin. His defense was that about half of this sum had been bequeathed him by his father, while the other half was the result of forty years of hard work. He and his father had always distrusted banks and the ordinary forms of investment; both had turned their profits into gold, hoarding it for the support of their old age.

Less than one year ago, this defense would have sufficed; or, to state the case more accurately, this old man would have been undisturbed in the possession of his property. Today, however, the gold is taken from him, exchanged for currency. Further, the Federal law must be vindicated. The judge declined to fine the old man \$10,000, and send him to the penitentiary, as he might have done; however, the prisoner was put on probation for one year.

Perhaps nothing in all the changes that have taken place since March 4 points more clearly than this case to the fact of a political revolution in this country. One or two instances may be added by way of confirmation. Anyone who possesses \$101 in gold coin, bullion, or gold certificate, may, upon conviction, be fined as much as \$10,000, and be sent to the penitentiary. By order of the Secretary of the Treasury, every person owning gold, coin, bullion, or certificate, was obliged under penalty to return it to the Treasury by January 17. A few exceptions were made for museums, numismatists, and others who held coins as scientific exhibits or as curiosities, and the individual citizen was permitted to retain two or three pieces, not exceeding in value \$2.50. Gold, in other words, has ceased to be currency, and those who continue to hold it

will find it less useful for exchange than so much counterfeit. It was to their advantage to hand it in long ago. Many did not choose to do so.

It is not our purpose here to contend that the order to hand over this gold, now useless for money, is unconstitutional, though many hold that it is. The Attorney General and one Federal Court have held the opposite. However, as these cases will in all probability be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States, judgment on the constitutionality of the Government's gold seizures is properly withheld for the present. But the fact cannot be denied that not even in our darkest days has the Federal Government acted in so radical a manner. The Attorney General invokes the right of eminent domain, and quotes many impressive Supreme Court decisions. As a part of the general monetary policy, including an embargo on exports of gold, the measures are declared necessary. We are really engaged in a fierce struggle with Great Britain and Japan for the world's markets, in which those two countries have enjoyed a marked advantage over us. It may very well be that by the time the laws reach the Supreme Court for review the eggs will be so thoroughly scrambled by a new stabilization that the Court will be unable to unscramble them.

Laws made during the piping times of peace have a way of retreating when the cannon begin to roar, whether the war is a conflict of arms, or of economic and social opinions. Our own Constitution was maintained in its integrity for approximately seventy-one years; since that time it has undergone many changes in the letter, and infinitely more in the spirit. As Jefferson wrote, Governments rarely relinquish a power once conceded, but always strive to increase and strengthen it. Our own Government is no exception. We drew up a Constitution for a religious-minded people, engaged for the most part in

agricultural pursuits, and deeply interested in the art and science of government. Fiercely self-reliant, independent in their views, as both the Constitutional Convention and the Conventions called by the States to consider the new Constitution amply show, suspicious of all official power not plainly, as Jefferson said, "bound in chains," they affirmed the Constitution as a charter of their inalienable rights. Yet only a few years passed, and at the dawn of the new century a great political party was wrecked as the result of a battle to decide the meaning of a clause in the document.

It may well be that we are on the eve of a greater battle. No longer are we an agricultural people, a religious-minded people, a people jealous of our rights, willing to battle for them in peaceful forums and, if necessary to die for them. God send it that in the New Era upon which we are entering, all the ancient safeguards of a people's inalienable rights against the Government be preserved, and that these safeguards be extended to protect rights, always existing in man's nature, but brought into conflict with Mammon, by the machine development of society in these later days.

### Congress and Lynching

**T**HROUGH the Wagner bill, Congress will again be asked to take cognizance of the great increase in lynching in 1933. In view of the opinion expressed by Attorney General Cummings, "since lynching is purely a local problem, it is impossible to develop inter-State aspects," it is quite unlikely that the bill will even be reported out of committee. In our judgment, relief should not be sought from Congress, because Congress can give none. A certain degree of useful publicity can be secured by debating the subject at Washington, but at that point the utility of these projects ends.

The Wagner bill in particular is so gross and open an intrusion upon the constitutional rights of the States that it is difficult to see how the courts could sustain it. The chief feature of the Wagner bill is the proposal to vest the Federal courts with jurisdiction to try all persons connected with a lynching, when the State instrumentalities of justice fail to enforce the law of the locality. Heavy penalties would be imposed upon State officers failing to protect those in their charge against mobs, or to exercise due care in apprehending lynchings. Finally, the United States can recover \$1,000 from the county in which the lynching takes place, the money to be given to the relatives of the murdered man, and if he has none, to be retained by the United States.

As Kelly Miller, of Howard University, writes in a letter to the *Chicago Tribune*, the Wagner bill is merely another indication of our habit of "looking to Washington for salvation for both our economic and moral sins." What is needed to curb lynching is not more laws, for new laws can be broken as easily as the older specimens, but the creation of an enlightened public opinion which will demand enforcement of the laws already enacted. When a mob is on the march, a whole battalion

of Federal statutes will not halt it, but one determined State official can usually break it. It would probably not afford much consolation to the victim in the hands of the mob to reflect that the Federal Government will be richer through his death by \$1,000. What he wishes is not this unique opportunity of benefiting the Government, but his life.

It is difficult to take the Wagner bill seriously. The possibility that it will be enacted by Congress is slight, and that it would be upheld by the courts is even slighter. It may be useful for propaganda purposes, but there are better kinds of propaganda, it seems to us, than bills which are plainly at variance with the Constitution. Tactics of this kind may weaken the whole cause, for in their way they are as lawless as lynching.

### What Is a Dollar Worth?

**W**HATEVER happens at Washington in the course of valuating the dollar, a dollar will continue to be worth ten dimes or twenty nickels. The ultimate result of the valuating process cannot be foretold confidently, for it is much like a surgical operation. When the surgeon is skilled, the patient will probably recover, and die of old age. But it is possible that he may die on the table.

According to the experts, the President is planning to establish a "managed" currency. Since a dollar is worth only what it will purchase, this planning appears to necessitate management by the Government of all the factors which bring about conditions under which a dollar can be exchanged for more of a commodity at one time than at another. Hence the Government must be able to manage the market, and it hopes to do this by "managing" the dollar, that is, by varying the gold content of the standard dollar. For example, if we assign a value of 100 cents to the dollar of 1926, the dollar of today, the President's advisers state, has a value of \$1.46. The Administration apparently proposes to reduce the gold content of the current dollar to a point at which it will purchase what the dollar purchased in 1926, and thereafter to increase or decrease the gold content in proportions which will keep the dollar at a fixed value.

On the face of it the plan means higher prices for commodities than the present low ones. If wages go up in the same proportion, we are no worse off, but also no better. Under the economic systems we have known, prices have always tended to rise more rapidly than wages; but if Dr. Warren's theories are true, a correction can be applied through a managed currency, whenever the index of prices shows that the price of gold and the cost of commodities are out of line. Many economists deny that this can be done. But the President is confident that with the Government's control of business, direct and indirect, and of the country's gold stocks, plus the cooperation of other countries, notably Great Britain, it can be done.

It need not be feared that the President's plan will wreck the markets or turn the world upside down, as



soon as it begins to operate. The effects will be slow and, probably, imperceptible to the man in the street. But the Government's chief job under a system of managed currency will be, it seems to us, the management of wages. As we go on the table, let us pray that the operation will be followed by the patient's speedy return to health.

## Catholic Press Month

**F**EBRUARY has been set aside as Catholic Press Month. It would be easy to transcribe approbations of the Catholic Press issued by our Holy Father, Pius XI, and his three predecessors in the Apostolic Chair. The Vicars of Christ have clearly perceived the utility and, it may be added, the necessity of the Catholic press in every land. On every possible occasion, they have urged the Faithful to support to the extent of their ability the apostolate to which the editors of our Catholic publications are dedicated.

At all times this apostolate is carried on under trying conditions. The work of the Catholic editor calls for learning and alertness, but it also demands the practice of virtue in no low degree. From the natural point of view, there is in it little or nothing that can allure, but in imitation of the Catholic teacher, the Catholic editor keeps at his task for the sole reason that through it he hopes to extend the Kingdom of God. To this apostolic work he devotes himself with cheerfulness, asking nothing except the opportunity of preaching, in the degree of his commission by authority, the Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Probably at no time since the religious revolt of the sixteenth century has the cause of God stood in greater need, humanly speaking, of a vigorous Catholic press. The whole world is being made over; international problems, unknown to our fathers, are discussed at every street corner, and every one has its religious, moral, and ethical implications. Is war essentially wrong? If not, when can it be justified? Among the peace societies, all claiming an exalted purpose, which ones deserve Catholic support, and which should be shunned? Do international debts impose a real obligation, and under what conditions may they properly be remitted? Has the Church herself a program for international peace, and on what is it based? These and a hundred other questions come up daily, and the intelligent Catholic, seeking the answer, needs the information which can be found only in our Catholic publications. Certainly, he will search the pages of our secular publications in vain, whether he takes up a tabloid "shocker," or buries his nose between the pages of our most respectable magazines.

Problems of hardly less importance clamor for his attention at home. The growing, restless power of government, both State and Federal, is encroaching upon fields of human activity once held reserved to the individual, the family, the school, or the Church. Some of these developments promise well. Others are fraught

with serious peril to us as Catholics, and to our institutions. These problems inevitably involve issues upon which we must take our stand as Catholics and as Americans, yet what is of prime importance to us in this double capacity is rarely treated with accuracy in the secular press, while the distinctly Catholic interest is all too often set forth in an atmosphere of distortion and innuendo. The Catholic who wishes a correct statement of the Catholic position on projects which concern him both as a citizen and as a Catholic, can find it, again, only in our Catholic publications.

For more than four years the Catholic editor has contrived to carry on, despite the depression, but in many parts of the country he catches a glimpse, now and then, of the end of the road and of his labors. He asks the help of our Catholic people, and he richly deserves it; yet, in truth, a subscription to a Catholic magazine is an offering, not to him, but to the cause of Christ. The Catholic press needs prayers, and it needs money, and we trust that an augmentation of both prayers and of money, in the form of subscriptions, will be its lot during the month of February.

This Review has often been proud and glad to beg for others, but it has never begged for itself. Yet at this time, Catholic Press Month, we ask our readers to remember our work in their prayers and, in addition, to help us by securing new subscribers. With a new subscriber for every subscriber now on our list, our work, blessed by the present Pontiff and his two predecessors, can be sustained and enlarged.

## Education and Crime

**T**HE committee appointed by the Senate in the spring of 1933 to investigate certain forms of crime has made its report. In presenting it to the Senate, the chairman of the committee, Senator Copeland, of New York, drew the attention of his colleagues to certain facts which had unpleasantly surprised him. The first of these facts was that the hardened criminal of today is usually under twenty-five years of age, and often a mere boy. According to the Senator, the largest age group of criminals is found at nineteen years, the next largest at eighteen, and the average age is twenty-three. "There is something wrong with the church, the school, and the home in America," comments the Senator. Particularly with respect to the school, it does not seem that the good effects are commensurate with the wealth of zeal with which we devote ourselves to its welfare. At this point, the Senator hit upon a truth that cannot be repeated too frequently.

Education, Mr. President, is not enough to do away with the development of criminal instincts. The most dangerous criminal often is the man who has had the best education. His very education becomes an aid to him in the progress of his criminal career.

Sad experience should have taught us the need of revising the high estimate which we as a people have set upon what in this country is officially known as education. But we still cling, with pathetic faith, to the per-

suasion that crime will disappear as soon as we have taught all our boys and girls to read and to write, and thereafter, by the aid of devious devices, to "get" through high school, and be "put" through college.

Although Senator Copeland realizes the shortcomings of secularized education, he "is not disposed to be very critical of the school" as it exists in these parts. Criticism may come later, when the educators who are assisting the committee present their suggestions "as to what may be done through the public schools, the colleges and the universities to do away with the development of criminal instincts." But if the teaching of religion, and of a moral code based upon it, is not recommended for the schools, we fear that these suggestions will not be of great value.

### Note and Comment

#### Good Manners At Washington

SOME weeks ago a clergyman had occasion to lodge a minor complaint with one of the Departments at Washington. In the old days, the answer would have been a printed form, which meant that the case was closed, and please don't bother us again. To his intense surprise, our clergyman received an official-looking document which began

THE REVEREND JOHN J. SMITH,  
CHURCH OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION,  
PLEASANT FIELDS, UTOPIA.

*Reverend and dear Father,*  
and ended,

Trusting that this explanation will be satisfactory, I remain, Reverend and dear Father, with great respect,

ROBERT E. CHESTERFIELD

which was the name of the first assistant in the Department, a man of renown in these States. But more follows. This same clergyman, whose hobby is a certain field in science (although what he knows of it was probably not news to schoolboys even in Ptolemy's time) wrote to one of the Bureaus asking how he could obtain a Government publication which interested him. "I disclose no names," he writes, "lest I involve this Bureau head in a Congressional investigation. In a most courteous letter, I was informed that the publication had been mailed to me, and that I might pay the bill, which he enclosed, at my convenience!" Since when has the Government been selling on credit? Or is it possible that hereafter Government officials will extend to the citizen the courtesies which are ordinary among gentlemen? Not even Emily Post could find fault with the tone and the forms of these two letters.

#### Race Relations Sunday

FOR the past eleven years the Federal Council of Churches has been promoting the observance of Race Relations Sunday, for increasing better understanding and better relationships between the various races that God's

Providence or man's scheming—as you view it—have brought to live together in this country. The twelfth annual observance of this Sunday falls this year on February 11. With the increase of interest in interracial problems, has come an increasing demand for accurate information as to the causes and cures of interracial friction. Material for this purpose is provided by the Department of Race Relations of the Federal Council, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York City, and may be had for the asking. A good part of this material, in folder form, will be helpful for Catholics interested in interracial work. Race prejudice, according to Dr. Emory S. Bogardus, of the University of Southern California, is an acquired trait, and since it is an acquired trait, it may be controlled and prevented to a surprising degree. We may learn, for instance, not to generalize upon adverse experiences with one or more persons, and thus to judge an entire race to which they belong. Catholics complain of this generalizing habit on the part of their non-Catholic brethren; and should be the first to see the fallacy involved in judging others as they would not wish to be judged themselves.

#### Loss of Catholic Landmark

FOR the pilgrimaging Maryland Founders, still lingering at the Barbadoes before starting their northward journey, the very beginning of the Tercentennial Year, 1934, brought sad news in the total destruction by fire on January 3 of fine old Bushwood Manor, in St. Mary's County, Maryland. Bushwood was one of the principal colonial Catholic landmarks in this country. It was originally the home of the Syles and of the Plowdens, famed in English Catholic as in Maryland history. Passing later into the hands of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Renehan, of Frederick County, it was devoted, after their decease, to the use of the teaching Sisters of Charity. Among its many distinctive features were the shelf altar, in the upper hall, where Mass was said in the Penal days, and in our own time by Cardinal Gibbons; also the exquisite scrollwork staircase. There, it is said, the colonists met in early days to deliberate upon the establishing of a mint to supply much-needed money in place of barter. There the Holy Sacrifice was offered up countless times by venerated missionaries, and religious instruction radiated to the surrounding countryside. Comfort, however, came to the Pilgrims, in the news that three lectures on the Foundation of Maryland were to be given at the Catholic Daughters of America Hall in Baltimore, under the joint auspices of Loyola College and Loyola High School: January 18, by Michael Williams, on "The Maryland Idea"; February 1, by J. Moss Ives, LL.D., on "The Political and Legal Aspect of the Early Colony," and March 15, by the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, on the "Ecclesiastical Aspect of the Early Colony." Said pious Father Andrew White, after the Pilgrims had encountered some pirates at the Barbadoes: "God who endeavoreth the spirituall good of Maryland preserved us from danger." So despite the sad loss of Bushwood, the Tercentennial will still succeed.



**"Flectamus Genua!  
Levate!"**

AT Sunday's Mass the priest will wear purple vestments and will omit the *Gloria*. The Septuagesima season is upon us, beginning nine Sundays before Easter and serving as a sort of transitional period from the joy of Christmas to the penitential mood of Lent. The liturgical changes made at this time in the color, mood, and theme of the Mass come down to us from ancient times and serve to recall certain related facts about the posture of the early Christians during their prayer. In our country, when we pray we kneel and clasp our hands. But few ancient records refer to folded hands as the proper gesture for supplication. Indeed, as we know from the Catacomb paintings and from numerous references in literature, the early Christian prayed standing, with his eyes lifted up to God and his arms outstretched like a cross—a posture which is still imitated, though in somewhat modified form, by the celebrant at the altar. This was the attitude for prayer for all on Sundays and during the joyous seasons of Christmas and Easter, and is still the custom in many Latin countries. Indeed, hard as it sounds to us easy-going moderns, the Faithful of the fourth and fifth centuries stood as a sign of respect throughout the sermon also—though the preachers of that time indulged in pretty lengthy exhortations. When, however, the penitential times of the year arrived, calling for acts of humility and prayers for mercy, the attitude was changed and the people knelt, just as we do today. And though, of course, they had nothing resembling our modern pews, it ought to be added for the sake of completeness that they sometimes sat, too—especially during the long Scripture readings of the Vigils and during Holy Week.

**Corresponding  
With Moscow**

THE children of the Truman Street School in New Haven, are engaged, according to the local press account, in preparing a group of letters to be sent to young Russians of Moscow's School 25. "Seymour B. Smith, principal of the school, said that the special group of pupils engaged in international correspondence under Miss Pearl Rosenstein, had nearly finished a scrapbook to be sent to the young Russians," who are returning the compliment. No significance, according to Mr. Smith is to be attached to this wholly informal correspondence, more than would be attached to similar correspondence with Japanese, Mexican, or other children of distant lands. However, without being unduly alarmist, one may ask if this is entirely true. The children of Moscow are trained from the cradle in something unknown to our American children: in systematic propaganda for a definite politico-ethical idea. The distinction between "formal" and "informal" for them is meaningless. Mr. Smith himself recalls the sharp rebuke that such correspondence drew from the Moscow children a couple of months ago when the Americans drew Russia with the contested Rumanian border as given in our American geography books. The Russian children's scrapbook, they are informed, will contain the words and music of

the "Internationale," a reply to "America the Beautiful" and the "Star Spangled Banner." In the meanwhile, the New Haven schools are being supported by public taxes as an experimentation ground for these adventures in dubious friendship. Yet to mention the name of God in a tax-supported school is ruled out as a violation of religious freedom.

**O'Neill  
Again**

THE judgments passed on Eugene O'Neill's new play, "Days without End," by Father Donnelly and in this issue by our own critic, Elizabeth Jordan, have been upheld by Richard Dana Skinner in the *Commonweal*. In his review of the play, Mr. Skinner says:

To many the towering paradox of victory in surrender will be lost. But to those who understand the universal soul of the mystic, in all times and all ages, the meaning will be plain enough. They will see the courage of humility, where others may see only softness or what they may defensively call sentimentality. Nietzsche could not follow Wagner from the incestuous circle of his dying gods to the illumination of Parsifal. And there are those who will not want to follow O'Neill, as the poet of the Electra problem, to the acceptance of the Christian mystery of resurrection through faith and surrender. . . . The struggle of John Loving, in O'Neill's play, is an agony of renunciation that will live in its spiritual implications among the great poetic and religious creations of the world's literature.

How true this is can be seen in the curious phenomenon observable among the critics. They cannot let it alone, but are returning to it again and again. One of them reprinted most of Father Donnelly's article. But most of all they have abandoned their task of dramatic criticism to enter the theological arena, and are struggling more or less violently against the ideas themselves. That they do not like these ideas goes without saying. O'Neill—or the O'Neill they thought they knew—has let them down. He has gone over to the other side. So they are attacking the ideas themselves under guise of criticizing the technique of the play (which they do not always get right, incidentally, misquoting it freely). But this is all to the good. It means that the theater may begin to signify something once more. That is the first step to its revival. Mr. Skinner shows clearly, from O'Neill's earlier writings, that this play is in direct line with his developing thought. But in "Days without End" there is no longer any doubt. He has flown the flag of faith.

**AMERICA  
A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK**

|                    |                                      |                |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| PAUL L. BLAKELY    | WILFRID PARSONS                      |                |
| GERARD B. DONNELLY | Editor-in-Chief                      |                |
|                    | FRANCIS X. TALBOT                    | JOHN LAFARGE   |
|                    | FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN                 | DANIEL BASSETT |
|                    | Associate Editors                    |                |
|                    | FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager |                |

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 . . . . . Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:  
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: MEadlison 3-3082  
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW  
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

## Catholic Art in Europe

HERBERT G. KRAMER, S.M.

**A**N impression that has forced itself upon me after several years of observation in contemporary Catholic art is that the situation in Europe differs widely from that in America. The fact that this difference is sometimes overlooked is one of the reasons why the religious art movement on one continent is not always correctly understood on the other. Moreover, since both are still in a sort of experimental stage, the situation being nowhere settled, one continent can learn much from the successes and failures of the other.

The problem of present-day Catholic art centers to a great extent on the choice of a form of expression. How shall Catholicism be expressed in art? Which style should be chosen for our churches and their furnishings? There are as many theories on these points as there are groups of ecclesiastical artists and art critics. Yet, it might be beneficial to insert here what I believe to be the general requirements of church style.

The first criterion should be the use to which a church is put. The ceremonies of the liturgy, participation of the Faithful, preaching, adaptations to private devotion—all these indicate specific demands which no other edifice requires.

Next, a church must differ from secular buildings because of its peculiar character as a house of God. In Gothic times, this distinction was preserved with marvelous success. A Gothic church is a different creation from a Gothic dwelling; yet both are masterpieces of their kind.

The third requirement of church style, that of social appeal, will be dealt with at the end of this paper.

Finally, inspiration should be drawn from what exists in each country. Style should differ with different peoples, with different climates, with different ages. Is it not odd that, while nations have always and everywhere put the stamp of their mentality on their customs, dress, habitations, literature, and music, we Catholics of the twentieth century should so often be content with building churches in copies or mere adaptations of former styles?

But the purpose of this article is to present briefly a few aspects of Catholic art in Europe. A second one will treat of conditions in America.

The dominating trend in Europe is undoubtedly characterized by a desire to depart from the old styles. Although some churches are being constructed in adaptations of old forms, the general European mind cannot view them with satisfaction, and is certain to give vent to very acrid criticism. Yet the building of a new church sometimes presents a veritable dilemma. A French writer (Pierre Chirol, in *La Vie Intellectuelle*, October 25, 1932) has expressed it, with perhaps a slight exaggeration, as follows:

The dilemma appears brutal: either the persistence of certain

features, pretendedly sacred, but regarded as such only by habit or routine, a deliberate regression to a bygone condition, an archaic mask, forcibly and unskilfully applied to a new program—or, on the other hand, an entire break with the past, and, consequently, under the pretext of sincerity, strange results. . . .

A number of very pleasing new churches have arisen in Europe. But, as is well known, the search for originality has more frequently been pushed to extremes and has made inexcusable errors, like that of capitalizing purely secular elements in a house of worship.

While this excessive modernism in religious art is especially (though by no means only) to be found in Germany, we must not get the impression that all Catholic art in Germany finds its expression in extremes. It is gratifying to read the following appreciation in an article on ecclesiastical architecture in Germany, by Dr. Rudolf Pfister (*Kunst und Handwerk*, No. 736, 1931):

Ecclesiastical architecture today has its conservative Right and its revolutionary Left wings, and also—to continue the analogy with practical politics—its relatively small moderate Center element. This Center, standing as it does midway between the conventional hankering after obsolete forms which deprives the Right wing of vitality and the grotesque exaggeration and rash experimentalism of the revolutionary element, contains the seed of all truly valuable development in this field.

Modern developments of Catholic art in Europe do not lack encouragement from the ranks of the critics and the artists themselves. But how do the people, the parishioners of the new churches, regard them? What do they demand of Catholic artists? I believe that, after that of the ecclesiastical authorities who set the norms for religious art, it is upon the opinion of the people that should depend the acceptability of the present Catholic art movement. It is in the faith and religious life of the people that Catholic art should have its source.

I am not prepared to give the answer for the whole of Europe. My knowledge on this point is limited to Switzerland, a country that is at present quite art-minded and is not unrepresentative of modern-art endeavor. The Swiss churches that are being built and decorated exemplify both the better kind of modern religious art and the most extreme. The above questions have been asked of a number of priests who have had recent dealings with artists. Their letters of response were published in the 1932 and 1933 numbers of *Ars Sacra*, an annual devoted to modern Swiss Catholic art. Although not necessarily representing the consensus of opinion of the Swiss clergy, they are nevertheless enlightening. Quotations from these letters follow:

The élite are always in advance of the masses. Principally from this fact arise, to my mind, the indifference, failure to understand, and even hostility of the people toward certain moderns and their works. . . . The opinion of the masses is to be formed here as in everything else. . . . In general, the people are very indulgent toward the artist; but they expect, in return a little condescension. Art, though the work of the élite, is not produced only for the élite, despite what is being said.



Should art try to please the people? That is certainly not its first function. . . . To announce truth is the first duty of the artist, not to please. . . . But it is another thing for art to believe that it need not take any consideration of the intellectual status and the attitude of the people. Ecclesiastical art is not only for a small group . . . but for the Christian community in its whole extent. When the work of the artist in no way touches the soul of the people, it has not fulfilled its function. . . . One finds opinions of artists pretending that the artist has not to bother about the people . . . and that the people themselves must seek the explanation of his products as best they can. . . . Only when the artist has taken a step toward the people, will the people also find its way toward the artist.

Our good people are to be won over to the new art by a kindly, unceasing attempt to gain their confidence. What the people cannot bear is to see the works of art that are dear to them despised and rejected.

After one has made them see the lack of art (in the works with which they are familiar) . . . the faithful readily accustom themselves to the new forms of sacred art. . . . But on two formal conditions: immediate *legibility* and *beauty* of features. Those (works) that purposely present ugly, grimacing . . . figures are repulsive to piety. Concrete cases conclusively prove the utter impossibility of the faithful to pray before statues that are grotesque and literally frightening. . . . The best traditions and the

principles of true art thus find a bond of union in the good common sense of the people.

There is always some distrust of the new. Besides, our people, who must struggle much to earn their material bread, are less affected by the beauty of new forms. Consequently, they adapt themselves only with difficulty. This new art at least has not the tangible effects one has a right to expect of it.

These citations are sufficient evidence that much that passes for religious art does not arouse the legitimately expected response in the Catholic heart. There are several kinds of "religious" art. There is that which merely treats a religious topic, without being religious in character. There is also that in which the artist endeavors to portray a religious sentiment, without being concerned whether others can see in his production what he does. But these two kinds cannot be said to have as object the elevation of the faithful to spiritual things; they have no *mission* in the religious community, as religious art should by its very nature.

Religious art should be a social art, a public art, if you want. And the modern Catholic art that is not that, cannot satisfy the human soul in its quest for God.

## A New Food and Drugs Act

FLOYD ANDERSON

ONE of the most important measures scheduled for the present session of Congress is the new legislation on food and drugs, Bill S. 1944. It is intended to replace the present Act, which was passed in 1906. So many defects have been revealed in it that drug and other manufacturers have been driving carloads of adulterated and otherwise dangerous products through it. For one thing, the 1906 Act did not apply to cosmetics, nor to many drugs.

An especially bad feature of it, in view of present conditions, is that the public has practically no control over advertising. It has jurisdiction only on that advertising matter placed on the label of the container. That was sufficient in 1906; but it is hopelessly inadequate now. Patent-medicine companies, and others of the sort, depend almost entirely on their huge newspaper, magazine, and radio advertising to sell their products. They can make as extravagant claims as they want in this advertising, and it is practically impossible for the Government to take action as long as the statements on the label of the product are true.

On December 7 and 8, a two-day public hearing was held on the bill before a Senate Commerce subcommittee at Washington, under the direction of Senator Royal S. Copeland, who has sponsored the bill. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace spoke at the first day's hearing, and pointed out that the bill made these provisions:

Cosmetics are brought within the scope of the statute.

Mechanical devices, offered for curative purposes, and devices and preparations claimed to bring about changes in the structure of the body are included.

False advertising of foods, drugs, and cosmetics is prohibited. Definitely informative labeling is required.

A drug which is, or may be, dangerous to health under the conditions of use prescribed in its labeling is classed as adulterated.

The promulgation of definitions and standards for foods, which will have the force and effect of law, subject, of course, to court review, is prescribed.

The bill has been drafted, I understand, principally in the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Agriculture. It is reported to have the strong support of President Roosevelt and other Democratic leaders. Rexford G. Tugwell, the Assistant Secretary, has had a prominent hand in the framing of the measure, and opponents of the bill have been making a considerable fuss over "Tugwellism," and "college professors," and other bugaboos to scare the public into opposing the bill.

The official title of the bill explains its purposes. It is intended "to prevent the manufacture, shipment, and sale of adulterated or misbranded food, drugs, and cosmetics, and to regulate traffic therein; to prevent the false advertisement of food, drugs, and cosmetics, and for other purposes."

There may be some who wonder at the need for new legislation covering foods and drugs. They may ask, why all this pother?

They should become acquainted with the "chamber of horrors." That is the informal name of an exhibit in the Food and Drug Administration building at Washington. Jonathan Mitchell, recently writing in the *New Republic*, competently describes it:

The bottles, tubes, jars, and food packages are neatly mounted on composition board, with legends beneath them describing the various kinds of death, permanent injury and loss of money suffered by their purchasers. The room is not a pleasant place; in the Food and Drug Administration it is known as the chamber of horrors. However, it gives you some notion of what the

drug interests in fact mean when they speak of property rights and free Americans. What they mean is the right of medicine manufacturers to make 500 and 1,000-per-cent profits from credulous, ignorant, and dying people.

Mr. Tugwell, in *Editor and Publisher* for September 16, describes in detail one of the exhibits. It is "a pint bottle of dark liquid which sells for \$12." Around the bottle is a collection of direct-mail leaflets claiming that the "nostrum will cure diabetes." There is also a bundle of testimonials written by people who had used the "medicine" and who declared that they were cured of diabetes. These testimonials had been numbered. On the other side of the bottle containing the liquid is a group of death certificates, which is, as Mr. Tugwell remarks, "grim evidence that no one can dispute." Check each numbered testimonial with the correspondingly numbered death certificate, and you "will find that the name, the address, and all descriptions are the same! Every one of the persons who wrote testimonials died—and the doctors in every case certified that the cause of the death was diabetes."

And there are many other dangerous concoctions, such as hair removers (which take off the skin as well), hair dyes and tonics, and "cures" for cancer and tuberculosis. Because of the limitations of the present Act, the Government can rarely obtain convictions against such frauds.

The proposed legislation plans to correct this by gaining a certain amount of control over advertising, and insisting that it be truthful. This is provided by Section 9, "False Advertisement," of which (a) says that "an advertisement of a food, drug, or cosmetic shall be deemed to be false if in any particular it is untrue, or by ambiguity or inference creates a misleading impression regarding such food, drug, or cosmetic."

Class (b) states that an advertisement of a drug shall also be considered false if it includes the name of a disease for which the drug is but a palliative, and not a specific cure, and "fails to state with equal prominence and in immediate connection with such name that the drug is not a cure for such disease." Also falling under the definition of "false" is any representation "directly or by ambiguity or inference" concerning the effect of a drug contrary to the general agreement of medical opinion.

It would consider false any advertisement of a drug which is represented as having any effect in the treatment of a number of diseases, some of which are appendicitis, bone diseases, cancer, diabetes, gall stones, paralysis, pneumonia, sinus infections, tuberculosis—this "to discourage the public advertisement for sale in interstate commerce" of these drugs.

Section 17 (a) prohibits certain acts, such as the "dissemination of any false advertisement by radio broadcast, United States mails, or in interstate commerce for the purpose of inducing, directly or indirectly, the purchase of foods, drugs, or cosmetics" or inducing the sale of such products. This section also contains a release for publishers, advertising agencies, and radio broadcast licensees from prosecution for disseminating a false advertisement if they furnish "the name and post-office ad-

dress of the person who contracted for or caused him to disseminate such advertisement." This quite obviously releases the publisher from any responsibility to the Government in connection with the false advertisements.

Some of the other provisions of this bill would allow factory inspection, the issuance of permits by the Secretary of Agriculture to manufacturers of foods, drugs, and cosmetics, records of interstate shipment, and investigations.

There is, of course, a great amount of opposition to the bill. This opposition should not be underrated, for it is composed of powerful interests who will go to almost any length to stop its passage. Most of the clamor against the bill comes from the drug manufacturers—or rather patent-medicine manufacturers. This is significant, because food and cosmetic manufacturers have not been nearly so noisy.

Many publishers' associations, advertising agency associations, and similar organizations are also arrayed against it. This, perhaps, is natural. The vast amount of advertising done by patent-medicine companies doubtless comprises a large part of the revenue of the members of these groups.

In regard to the publishers, I have seen a pamphlet put out by the National Publishers Association, or, rather, coming from its office. The pamphlet itself is anonymous, with nothing to show its parentage. It lists "seven fundamental defects," and claims the bill will enable the Secretary of Agriculture:

- (a) To eliminate advertising of many medicinal products.
- (b) To eliminate advertising of some germicides, antiseptics, and disinfectants.
- (c) To reduce advertising of canned fruits, vegetables, and many other products by substituting government grades for advertised brands.
- (d) To lessen advertising throughout all classifications of food, cosmetics, and drug advertising by creating difficult conditions of copywriting and market.

Thus their main reason for opposing the bill appears to be that it will cut down advertising revenue. They have sided with the manufacturers of dangerous drugs and fake medicines against the interest of the public because of their greed for more profits. You will note they feel that "difficult conditions of copy writing" will be created by the bill. There will. Advertisers must tell the truth about their products.

Those opposing the bill have secured the assistance of many politicians. Jonathan Mitchell, in the *New Republic*, reports that because of the Food and Drug Administration's exhibit of a patent medicine, "Crazy Crystals," which comes from Texas, "the Texas Congressional delegation, almost to a man, has been pledged to fight the Administration's bill." The vote on the measure—and Vice President Garner's attitude toward it—will be interesting to watch.

An interesting sidelight is a letter which Representative Mead sent the Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He felt that the Department of Agriculture officials should not present their views on the bill to the country, but should merely sub-



mit them to the Congressional committees and leave the issues to them. Mr. Mead has seemingly overlooked the radio broadcasts of President Roosevelt.

Apparently, however, Mr. Mead condones the methods used by the bill's opponents. I wonder if he has read of the letter which a cough-medicine concern is reported to have sent to all newspapers in which it advertises. It warns the newspapers that they will lose a considerable amount of advertising revenue if the proposed bill is passed. It asks them to take an aggressive stand against it for their own business interests "and the best interests in your community"—in that order. It continues:

An isolated editorial or two will not suffice in this matter.

1. You need to take an aggressive stand against this measure.
2. You need to bring all the personal pressure you can upon your Senators and Representatives.
3. You need to enlighten and thereby arouse your public against this bill that is calculated greatly to restrict personal rights.

Mr. Mitchell reported in the November 8 *New Republic* on the activities of these opponents. He said that he had "seen in the last few days half a dozen editorials, all suspiciously alike, from scattered small-town newspapers." A magazine that I have seen requests its readers to send protests against the bill to the editors, who will forward them to the proper Congressional representatives. They say they censor their advertising, but they

carry a third of a page advertising a preparation which contains acetanilide, which Arthur Kallet and F. J. Schlink, in "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," say is a common constituent of "headache cures which have been responsible for thousands of cases of poisoning and many deaths."

A Senate Commerce subcommittee is now engaged in smoothing out some admitted defects in the bill. But if the bill is emasculated, it will be a matter of great concern, not only to the country, but to every reputable manufacturer and distributor of the merchandise covered by the bill. As Mr. Tugwell wrote, the bill places the responsibility where it belongs, "on the shoulders of manufacturers." A reputable manufacturer should have no hesitancy in accepting that responsibility.

In this message to Congress on January 3, Mr. Roosevelt said that "we have been shocked by many notorious examples of injuries done our citizens by persons or groups who have been living off their neighbors by the use of methods either unethical or criminal." The people whose infamous practices have made this bill imperative might well be placed in the first category, and some even in the second.

[A communication from Mr. Anderson with additional information appears on page 409.—Ed. AMERICA.]

## Poor Lady More!

THEODORE MAYNARD

IT is sometimes said—not out of cynicism, but of a recognition of the weakness of ordinary humanity—that a saint is a hard person to live with. Not that the world is entirely surrendered to sinners: on the contrary, though they sometimes prosper for a time, their feet are set in slippery places. But conventions, as well as the laws of the world, have been drawn up with humdrum respectability in mind. As one does not bargain for saints, it is considered lucky that one does not often get them.

I must confess to being comfortably tinged with the prevailing prejudice. Even the saints whom I most admire, when I read about them in books—let us say those delightful people Francis, Philip Neri, and Teresa of Avila—would be a trifle dazzling at close quarters. The circumstances of their lives were altogether alien from my own. But with Blessed Thomas More, a layman, a married man (twice over), the father of a family, a very busy man, and a literary man, I can feel at home. There is no need for me to say that I do not come within a hundred miles of his virtue, or even of his sweetness of temper. Nevertheless, I have more in common with him than with any other of the blessed. Indeed I can consider this most sociable of mortals as a personal friend, as well as a heroic example.

All the same, I am a little sorry for Lady More.

He married her when he was thirty-four and she a woman some years older. Six years earlier he had married Jane Colt, then a girl of seventeen, and therefore

young enough for him to teach her music and Latin. Even that marriage had not been exactly romantic, for the rising young lawyer and member of Parliament had thought of marrying her younger sister until he saw that Jane was hurt at being passed over. But Thomas gave her a tender if perhaps not passionate devotion, and when twenty years after her death he wrote her epitaph, he called her *Uxorcula Mori*—the little wife of More. She was the wife of his youth, and the mother of his four children.

A month after her death he married, with a dispensation from banns, Alice Middleton, a widow with a daughter ten years old. There was no pretense about being in love. He needed someone who could look after his young children. Another girl of seventeen would not have been suitable. As soon as he came across Mrs. Middleton, a good housekeeper whose talents were not being employed, he did not stand upon the conventions but married her at the earliest possible moment.

And to Alice he was a good husband. She was too old for him to make a humanist out of her, and, I suppose, Latin and philosophy were rather beyond her grasp. He did give her lessons in singing and playing on the lute. No doubt she was better than Jane had ever been at managing a household, and probably liked it better. Yet I fancy that she sometimes felt out of things. Perhaps the singing lessons were a help in the circumstances. More was the kindest of men. But when Erasmus was staying with them, and when the children,

Margaret, Elizabeth, Cecily and John, were carrying on a hilarious Latin conversation, Lady More (as she now was) must have sometimes thought that she would willingly know less about cookery and more of Cicero. Even when the conversation was in English (as it generally must have been), the allusions in it must have been above her head. And she was totally devoid of humor.

We must not fall into the historical error of supposing that the middle ages, or the early sixteenth century, thought of certain matters as we do. Romantic love was not considered necessary to a happy marriage. Rather the two things were regarded as normally opposed. And learning among women was almost unheard of. So Alice More had to draw upon all the consolation that her formidable common sense could offer. She could (and I do not doubt did) toss her head at the idea of her husband making his children learn Greek. It is more likely than not that she could not herself even read English. At any rate, no letter to her is in existence. But all the consolations of common sense must, at bad moments, have seemed less than the consolations of philosophy, could she only have had them.

Her own disposition was not exactly sweet. Though there is no need to describe her as a shrew, she had a sharp tongue. And things did not always go well in the kitchen. Erasmus could write of his bosom friend: "Of so accommodating a disposition is he . . . that if any defect appears that cannot be corrected, he sets himself to love it as though it were the happiest thing in the world."

This was written, as appears from the context, with Alice in mind, and is no more than just to Thomas. But after all a bachelor friend—and one, too, who was used to being waited on hand and foot—may not have understood all the complexities of domestic economy. If Alice was at times out of temper, can we blame her—with Erasmus as a guest?

At the same time, we can well believe that the easy-going More—whom his son-in-law William Roper said he had never seen so much as ruffled, and who Stapleton (writing with all the reminiscences of More's surviving relatives and friends at his disposal) said was only known to have been angry twice in his life—had frequently enough a test for his charming temper from the testy Alice. It is perfectly clear that he enjoyed, and taught his household to enjoy, the peculiarities of the admirable lady who looked so well after their comfort. If she had no humor, she was a beautiful fountain of unconscious humor. The fact that she could never see a joke was one of the best jokes of all.

Margaret appreciated the rich juiciness of her character. At least we may infer as much from what Margaret's husband, Roper, has to say, as also from Margaret's strong resemblance to her father. Yet never a direct word of criticism appears from any of them. For that we have to go to Erasmus, an outsider, and to Stapleton, who never knew her. Roper was not present at Lady More's interview with her husband in the Tower, but it must have been recounted by More to Margaret, and

Roper knew his mother-in-law well enough to record for us the very tone of her voice. She had burst in upon Sir Thomas, full of her impatience with his pedantry, telling him that he was a fool to stay there when, by speaking a word, he could win back the King's favor.

After a while, Roper tells us, More, who had listened quietly, said, "I pray thee, good Mistress Alice, tell me one thing!"

"What is that?" she said.

"Is not this house as nigh heaven as my own?"

To this she answered, after her accustomed homely fashion, "Tilly-vally! Tilly-vally!"

Can we not sympathize with her impatience? How could she be expected to understand? Even Margaret, who understood, tried to persuade her father to compromise. All that Lady More could see was that ten years after she had married Thomas More he had been knighted, that he had been successively since then Under-Treasurer, Speaker of the House of Commons, High Steward of Oxford University, High Steward of Cambridge University, negotiator of the Treaty of Cambrai, and Lord Chancellor. She had put up with his devotional practices, his Fridays of retirement and fasting, and his days of penitential exercises. One had to humor a man with an assured position, the favor of the king, and a fine house at Chelsea. She had no objection to her husband being a genius, or, if the fancy took him, a saint; but she simply could not see why he should be a fool. If this was the consequence of reading philosophy and poetry late into the night, it only confirmed the suspicion she had always had that books were full of a lot of nonsense.

For some time before Sir Thomas More had been put in the Tower she had been obliged to curtail expenses. Why, they had even been reduced to burning ferns in the fire-place! And, though she had grumbled, she had loyally endured it. Now her husband had taken a course that would lead him to the block, and involve the confiscation of all his property. But she knew from past experience that there was no use in arguing with him. Tilly-vally! Tilly-vally!

She did not weep. Sir William Richmond, the custodian of the Tower was so overcome with his feelings that he had to be consoled by his own prisoner. Margaret, on the day of the sentence, burst through the guards three or four times to embrace her father. Lady More was not given to tears. She had lived twenty-four years with a saint as his wife, but she could not conceive how he could be so odd as to refuse to do what everybody in the country—except that other book-crazed man, the Bishop of Rochester, and a few Carthusian monks, who never spoke even to one another—was quite willing to do.

Had she not made every possible allowance? When the bishops had come to her husband some years before, offering him no less than £5,000 (something like \$500,000 in modern money) for his services in writing against heresy, he had whimsically refused it as not being enough. And she had let him have his own way. Now he was pushing a joke altogether too far. "Tilly-vally! Tilly-vally!"



## The Pastor and Pseudo-Invalids

WILL W. WHALEN

THE primary purpose of a priest is to offer the Great Sacrifice to God Our Father. The primary purpose of a parish priest is to have his flock at that Mass Sacrifice. All pastors are gravely concerned when any of their parishioners wilfully misses Mass. The speedy motor car helps priests to take Holy Communion to those who cannot attend Mass and bring their Lord to all those who are prevented from coming to Him. It is about abuse of this boon that I wish to write.

With careless, lukewarm, or bad Catholics a little religion goes a long way. They want their religion made too easy for them. Such people sometimes impose on priests. In my extreme youth I took Holy Communion monthly to a woman who had married outside the Church, raised all her children pagans, and was now, she thought, too sickly to attend Mass. At her request I brought her Holy Communion weekly. It was a big parish, and a hard one; the other two priests whom I assisted being semi-invalids, I was literally run off my feet. Yet, if I happened to be a little late in reaching that woman, the phone rang peremptorily and her husband spoke his mind peevishly about my delay. If a funeral prevented my going to her at all, one of her pagan children would call at the rectory, demanding to know why I had not appeared.

When I learned that my ailing parishioner attended the movies twice a week, I meekly suggested to her that she might struggle in to Mass on Sundays. But she saw no reason why she should so exert herself. At last she did come, but it was only when I flatly refused to attend her any longer. I am told now that she never misses.

A tourist was boarding in an out-of-the-way farmhouse in these mountains. She wanted to receive Holy Communion every First Friday. As it was winter and snow drifts obstructed the road, I sometimes found it difficult to reach her, though I invariably did. During the last week of her stay, circumstances were such that the lady came to board here at my rectory. I said Mass in my chapel in the house each morning. She was never present. On the First Friday I suggested that I would bring Holy Communion to her bedside. She said she did not feel quite well enough. While taking breakfast, imagine my surprise when the poor invalid swept into the room in a blaze of glory and ate four fried eggs and five slices of toast! Her repast over, I bluntly informed her she was now well enough to return to her husband. He has never spoken to me since.

Twenty years ago a lady buried her son. Never did I behold such sad eyes, such deep grief, such elaborate trappings of woe. Trailing clouds of sorrow, she took pains to show how well made and how expensive all that black was. She dramatized herself as a broken-hearted mother and, becoming a recluse, never attended Mass from that day to this. The priest now brings her Holy Communion at least once a month. Does she live at a

great distance? About three blocks from her city church. Yet recently she drove eighty miles to pay me a visit.

A worse case. More than fifty years back a young belle gave considerable encouragement to two ardent admirers. One of them killed the other because of her too lavish smiles. Feeling that her life was shattered, she took to her bed and has not left it to this day—except when nobody was about to expose her. In all those fifty years she has not attended Mass once. The priest brings her Holy Communion, of course. Now, any woman who can stay in bed for half a century is not exactly a frail lily of the field. She is still living and very much alive. Today she looks to me pretty much the same as she did twenty-two years ago when I visited her first.

A woman in these mountains used to make the trying trip to Mass. Her Ford had eight miles to go and never missed. She approached the altar rail every Sunday. She is afflicted with epilepsy, but never once in my seventeen years here has she suffered an attack during Mass. Now she has left us and gone to stay with her brother in a city. I caught sight of her here at Mass last Sunday—again after that drive of eight miles. In the cemetery she whispered to me that she was glad to be able to visit back here so that she could again get to church. She had never been at Mass once since she left this widely scattered parish. Her too kindly pastor brings her Holy Communion weekly, but there is no reason under heaven why she should not go to church. Barring those intermittent epileptic seizures, she is as staunch as a cedar of Lebanon.

I know devout women in these Blue Ridge Mountains who are beyond eighty years of age. Only in the very worst storms do they ever miss Mass, and often not even then. And they drag themselves over terrifically long distances, yet they would feel hurt if I offered to bring them Holy Communion. No, they want to receive at Mass, and they do this very frequently. They keep their health by not nursing themselves overmuch. The Sunday trip to them is a delight. They get out of their narrow, isolated farmhouses and meet their friends and relatives at the church. Only *in extremis* do they have the priest bring them the Divine Guest.

There are certain types of women who make themselves actresses without realizing it. They go to the picture palaces and fancy themselves the anguished, beautiful girl on the screen. They suffer with her . . . while audibly consuming caramels . . . and Lucky Strikes. Aye, in the twilight of the theater a maiden blush settles upon their dowager cheek as the handsome hero kisses the hand of the beautiful heroine. All well and good. But none of us has a right to trifle with our duty to God. We must not be theatrical in matters of religion.

I am getting old now and feel even older than I am. The priesthood does not spare a man. The hard work

of the ministry has certainly worn me down. And even I feel acutely uncomfortable when I ponder my early mistakes . . . not to mention later ones. I see a boy priest feverishly rushing about in an old Ford car, carrying the Son of God to pseudo-invalids. In those days I used barrels of gasoline; now I wish I had more often used the horse God gave me, especially horse sense. What

a pity that wisdom comes to us so late! We have, then, only a few more years to employ and enjoy it. I am only hoping now that when the White Veil is gone and I am prostrated in fear before the Wounded Feet, my Master will forgive me the times I helped to keep from Mass lukewarm souls who so badly needed its benefits.

### Education

## Is Catholic Education "Overdone"?

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

TO the current number of the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, the Right Rev. Msgr. M. A. Schumacher contributes an article entitled "Catholic Education: Overdone and Underdone." After reading the paper three times, with growing amazement, I turned to a document entitled "An Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pius XI on the Christian Education of Youth," and then slipped back to my normal calm. With William George Ward, I cannot have an infallible pronouncement at breakfast every morning with my *Times*, but I can always take refuge in an Encyclical.

It seems to me that if Msgr. Schumacher is followed in the changes he proposes to make in the scheme and plan of Catholic education, we shall be obliged to bid adieu to Pius XI. Still, as we are not going to embark on that perilous course, there is no reason for fear, and perhaps not much reason for indulgence even in amazement.

Briefly, what Msgr. Schumacher suggests, to replace the present integration of Catholic elementary and secondary schools with the Catholic college and university, is a truncated system which ends with the junior high school. "Give the pupils a genuine training in the heart for eight years; make them living Catholics and good Catholics," he writes. "Because they have then, and only then, attained to the real use of reason, give them just two years more study of the reasons of their faith." After this training, "turn our graduates into missionaries; let them contact with Protestantism and try to convert Protestantism." This missionary work is to be inaugurated by sending them (except "those who need still higher Catholic schools for special vocations") to the public high schools, and thereafter to the non-Catholic colleges and universities.

If we "place some trust in the efficacy of the Sacraments," writes Monsignor, we need not fear that the result will be ruin. "Send them into the public high schools after two years of high school, and while you will lose 10,000 (who would probably be lost anyway) you will save 100,000 who could have been saved in no other way." Give the plan a fair trial, he argues, let Catholics or, at least, the pastor, "get back on the [public] high-school board," and put our Catholic educators in the non-Catholic universities, along with our Catholic boys and girls. The result will be a revival of faith in this country, and the universities, purged of paganism, may even adopt "our own

scholastic system of philosophy." While I have no doubt that with Catholic educators in control of our American universities, our Catholic students would suffer no harm, I for one must decline to be led away captive by the zealous Monsignor's enthusiasm.

My preference is for the old Catholic folkways, marked out for us by Pius XI.

But, plainly, Msgr. Schumacher believes that Catholic education in this country is in a bad way. Catholic parents, Catholic educators, and even our pastors, entertain the most bizarre ideas on the subject. Here are some of them.

The boy graduates from a parochial school, and forgetting our guarantee we throw up our hands in holy horror because he will go straight to perdition if he does not go to a Catholic high school. Again we recognize inefficient training, for up go the hands again and he must go to a Catholic college; and let no bell toll if later he fails to enter a Catholic university.

Passing over the pantomime which Monsignor uses merely to point his moral, this paragraph refers, I suppose, to the persuasion of most Catholics, thank God, that they are obliged to procure a genuinely Catholic education for their children. Hence they are surprised and grieved when they observe that this obligation is neglected. However, I think we must add Pius XI to the group pictured by Monsignor, since the Pontiff seems to feel the same way about it. In describing the school which alone is "a fit place for Catholic students," the Pope writes in his Encyclical on Education:

To be this [a fit place for Catholic students], it is necessary that all the teaching and the whole organization of the school, and its teachers, syllabus, and textbooks in every branch, be regulated by the Christian spirit, under the direction and maternal supervision of the Church; so that religion may be in very truth the foundation and crown of the youth's entire training; and this in every grade of the school, not only the elementary, but the intermediate and the higher institutions of learning as well. (*Italics inserted.*)

Clearly, then, if we listen to the Holy Father's instruction to keep all our young people, as far as may be possible, in Catholic colleges and universities, Monsignor's plan of ending the Catholic educational system with the junior high school must fall to the ground. The Pontiff describes in detail the schools which he considers proper for Catholic students, and certainly our American colleges and universities do not measure up to his requirements. Since in them religion is *not* the foundation and crown of



the entire training, or, in truth, any part of it, they are wholly unfit for our Catholic young people. If this is "overdoing" Catholic education, the Bishop of Rome is the culpable cause.

But Monsignor would not only abolish our high schools, colleges, and universities. The real reason why any at all are founded seems to escape him:

No one doubts the utility of some high schools, some colleges, and some universities which are Catholic not only in name but in fact, but is not the construction of so many institutions of higher learning an open admission that the lower ones have singularly failed of their purpose?

The answer to this direct question is, of course, "no." The effort to strengthen existing institutions of higher learning, and to found new colleges and universities, is not a confession that the elementary and secondary schools "have singularly failed." It is merely the realization of the genuinely Catholic desire that every Catholic student shall have the opportunity of initiating and of continuing, in the spirit of the Catholic Church, his education under truly Catholic auspices. From the beginning, the Church has vindicated her right to found not merely elementary schools, but also colleges and universities (Canon 1375), not through fear of failure in the lower schools, but that the system may be complete. Hence, according to Canon 1379, when the universities founded by public authority are not regulated by Catholic teaching and a Catholic spirit, a Catholic university is to be founded in that country or region. It belongs to our ecclesiastical superiors to give effect to this Canon, as circumstances may require, but the Canon itself suffices to show that, as far as may be possible, Catholic students must obtain *their entire training*, from the kindergarten to the university, in Catholic institutions. Neither the Canons, nor the Papal instructions on education, nor the history of the Church's unbroken interest in and support of higher education for her children in Catholic institutions, can countenance as sufficient for our Catholic people an educational system which terminates abruptly with the junior high school.

One further point calls for examination. In two places, Msgr. Schumacher appears to think that Catholic educators attach a most extraordinary "guarantee" to attendance at a Catholic school. "... Zealous pastors," he writes, "give almost a guarantee that attendance at a Catholic school will substitute for every other deficiency." In the second instance, however, the qualifying "almost" is omitted. Assuredly, Monsignor must not be held responsible for my ignorance, but although my interest in Catholic education dates back for nearly forty years, I have never heard of a Catholic educator or pastor who gave this "guarantee." Such a guarantee, seriously and soberly asserted, would bring one within the shadow of a Tridentine anathema. (*Canones de iustificatione*, canon 16; see also, *Decretum de Iustificatione*; cap. 13, *de perseverantiae munere*.) Any suggestion that a child trained in a Catholic school will certainly remain faithful to the end is, of course, directly contrary to Catholic teaching. I am persuaded that the instances which Monsignor has in mind are rare exceptions.

But what, generally, is the effect of a Catholic education upon the individual? We do what we are commanded to do, when we send our young people to Catholic schools. The teachers there will introduce them to the only education which, in the opinion of Pius XI, can be called education. They will train these young people in religion, shield them from evil influences (particularly from those which are at work in non-Catholic schools of every grade) give them good example, and pray for them. At the end of the course, they send them out into the world, hoping with well-founded hope, that they will remain faithful. At the same time, they realize that when Our Divine Lord went up to Jerusalem, one of the pupils trained in His own school sold Him, another denied Him, and all, save one, fled away, leaving Him in the hands of the persecutors. But they also remember that Peter repented, and that all who had fled came back. Hence they hope that those among their pupils who may leave Christ to follow a godless world, will also come back. At least our Catholic teachers have taught them that there is something to which they can always come back—the infinite Love of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Who shall say that this work is lost?

Incidentally, I cannot help wondering who has been supplying Msgr. Schumacher with "statistics of prison population." Statistics with which I have worked (and I have sought them far and wide) always break down when I test them as evidence (1) that the prisoner was baptized in infancy, (2) that the prisoner ever practised any religion, and (3) that the prisoner spent any considerable time in a Catholic school. In the absence of evidence on these points, mere figures are wholly worthless, and examination of conclusions based upon them, is time lost. Perhaps in this respect also, Msgr. Schumacher can enlighten my ignorance.

## Sociology

### Washington Welshes on Wages

JOHN WILBYE

AS Steele said of Lady Elizabeth Hastings, to know this New Deal is equivalent to a liberal education. You get another view every day, and in trying to follow these kaleidoscopic changes, the mind acquires a flexibility and a quality of lightness that are wholly delightful. Now you see it, and now you do not, like the pea under the shell. In a moment of doubt, you listen to the Hon. J. Farley, and the result is like a cheering slap on the back; anon you attune the ear to Dr. Tugwell or Professor Warren and, with the man who inadvertently picked up "The Ring and the Book," you fear that reason totters on its crystalline throne. One need never lack for something to argue about in these hectic days. Compared with his cousin Franklin, the once vaunted T. R., flourishing his big stick, is a correct old gentleman asleep with his *Spectator* in the warmest nook of the club library.

The voice of one who has tried to acquire this liberal education is speaking to you; a sad, diminished voice.

For instance: I hugged myself with delight when I read that one of the chief objectives of the New Deal was to raise wages. Unless the people had money, it was argued, they could not buy, and unless people began to buy, the wheels of commerce would not begin to move. It was all a bit like the Mother Goose rhyme about the stick beginning to beat the dog, and something like that legend, prevalent in 1865, that the Government was going to give everybody forty acres and a mule; but both comparisons I thrust from me as suspicions worthy only of the National Republican Campaign Committee. After some reflection, it seemed to me that the plan was plausible and even possible, and I was convinced that the Government meant what it said when it announced its intention of persuading every employer to raise wages, and to get ready to pay a true living wage at the earliest possible date.

I now know that my understanding was in error. I am not thinking of the steel manufacturers, the coal operators, the administrators of large and opulent public-utility corporations, some of whom seem to have bluffed the Government to a standstill. I am thinking of the largest employer, by far the largest employer, of labor in the United States.

When I discover that this employer has slashed wages by fifteen per cent, and discover, further, that this slash was made not by reluctant permission of the Government, but by the Government's peremptory order, I reach certain conclusions. One of them is that my ancient concept of higher wages as a necessary concomitant of the New Deal is ludicrously inaccurate. The conclusion gathers strength when I observe that this employer of labor (who has winged the Blue Eagle, and, shocking to relate, has made the cheery speeches of Administrator Johnson sound as reasonable as the ravings of the late John McCullough) is the Federal Government itself.

If you doubt my word, look up the *Congressional Record*. This unimpeachable publication will inform you that by a vote of 197 to 192, the House has decided that the Government must welsh on wages. It was confidently expected, and in fact was admitted by the Democratic floor leader in the House, that the flat reduction in the wages of Federal employes, ordered on April 1, 1933, would be repealed, and the old wage scale restored. But, on a plea of economy, the House decided to keep the cut until July 1, and then reduce it to ten per cent. Meanwhile, all other employers, under pain of being cast out as Tories, are to continue the wage rates as inflated by Administrator Johnson and his trained Eagle.

I do not know how many billions the AAA, the CAB, the CCC, the CSB, and the twenty other Federal services which, according to Governor Smith, make up Washington's alphabet soup, are going to spend this year. But I hope they will spend all they can extort, and then ask for more. Good wages are a good investment. If economy is a good dog, distribution is a better, but there is no enmity between the two. Economy means a proper use of money, not a death-like clutch on it. It does not mean saving money by losing something that is worth more

than money. By its action two weeks ago, the Government which is preparing to spend about \$300,000,000 every month on various public-works projects, designed chiefly to restore purchasing power, will save about \$100,000,000 in twelve months. Is that economy? I doubt it. In my judgment, it is a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy.

To begin with, it will decrease the purchasing power of the employes affected by \$100,000,000. That may not seem a great sum, but when the Government is begging the States and cities to come forward with more civil-works plans, and to institute plans of their own, so that the dole may be avoided, it is by no means a contemptible sum. If spending stimulates recovery, it is absurd to cut wages, and make spending impossible. The purchasing power of the Federal employe is worth exactly as much as the purchasing power of any other wage earner.

In the next place, we have been told (and it is high time) that in fixing a wage we must consider the social consequences as these affect the worker. Compared with the tremendous monthly expenditures of the Government, a budgetary savings of \$8,500,000 per month is practically negligible. On the other hand, that sum subtracted from the pay envelope of the employe necessitates strict retrenchment, and in some cases creates actual want. A cut of ten per cent can mean that the family which up to the present has struggled along with barely enough, now has less than enough. This so-called economy will also add to the difficulties of the butcher, the grocer, and the other neighborhood sellers of commodities, patronized by the Government employes.

Thirdly, it is said that the cut is justified by the fall in the cost of living. I do not know the origin of the figures used to sustain this contention, but statistics issued before consideration of the matter came before Congress do not substantiate it. According to the Bureau of Labor, the net increase in commodity prices from March 4, 1933, to December 16, 1933, was 18.8 per cent. This is the very time, it should be remembered, when the Federal employes began to work under the fifteen per cent cut. Between April 15 and December 5, 1933, retail prices of food for the whole country rose by 16.7 per cent, and the rise in Washington was 17.7. Even if these figures be set aside, or reduced, how can the Government's determination to force an advance in the retail prices of commodities be reconciled with its policy of decreasing the wages of its employes? The extreme difficulty of keeping a due proportion between prices in a rising market, and wages, is a commonplace with that dour group, the economists. Prices always tend to rise much faster than wages. If employers in general take heart from the example of the Government, and cut wages as commodity prices increase, the lag between the two will be frightful. The New Deal will then be the most devastating deal this country has yet experienced.

The Administration is today committed to an inconsistent position that will certainly weaken its influence. It advises employers to deal liberally with the worker, and threatens him with penalties if he fails to take this advice. At the same time, it adopts for itself an exactly contrary



policy. Tom, Dick, and Harry, and the rest of the sturdy yeomanry, are not economists or financiers on a national scale. They do not know what symmetallism is, and they have not thought deeply on credit, or the commodity dollar. But they know what inconsistency is, and are quick to recognize unfair treatment. Let them see a little more of either at Washington, and many of the excellent programs which the Administration is fostering will go to smash when the next Congress is elected. The President is now at the top of his power, yet a shift of just three votes would have beaten his budget. The revolt of the Democrats is significant of a dissatisfaction which, with a little Republican aid, will set the Administration afloat down Salt River.

Finally, as has been frequently asserted in these pages, a flat cut for all employes is shockingly unfair. The stenographer, trying to support her mother and a trio of little brothers and sisters, needs every penny of her meager stipend. To President Roosevelt, with his salary of \$75,000, his allowances, and his independent fortune, the cut means exactly nothing, and it is a matter for surprise that the President, so liberal in other respects, seems never to have thought of a graduated cut. I am told that post-office substitutes, who work for \$7.00 per week—when they can get work—are also compelled to take the fifteen-per-cent reduction. The story seems hardly credible, yet in many instances, through enforced furloughs without pay, and vacations spent under the same happy circumstances, low-salaried employes have taken cuts that were nearer to twenty-five and thirty per cent than fifteen. No salary below \$2,000 should be touched. If the Government feels itself obliged to withdraw \$100,000,000 from business by preventing its employes from spending that sum (for that is what this wage cut means) let it arrange a graduated scale for salaries above \$2,000, with liberal allowances, however, for wage earners with dependents.

As the *New York Evening Post*, a friendly journal, remarks editorially, the Government's treatment of its employes is one of the mysteries of the Roosevelt Administration. Surely it is time for the Government, if it wishes the major policies of the Administration to merit and receive support, to fall in line with decent employers, and win the right to the Blue Eagle. The spectacle of Washington welshing on wages is more than disheartening. It casts very grave doubt on the good faith of the Government in its apparent advocacy of the rights of wage earners under the New Deal.

### With Scrip and Staff

ONCE upon a time there presided over the monastery or *Laura* of St. Euthymius a very learned Abbot, named Aaron. To avoid controversies as to precedence in the meetings of the abbots, he had them adopt a resolution, that neither wisdom, nor size of monastery, nor age should determine their rank, but the alphabet alone, as in

the proceedings of the League of Nations. Being scientifically inclined, Abbot Aaron invented a marvelous light, which illumined the *Laura* as by magic. Numerous *ampullae*, or little vitreous jars, hung by wire from the ceilings of the various chambers, were made to glow inwardly by the mere process of snapping a tiny lever in the wall. These the monks called lightning jars, and they were the eighth wonder of the world.

Two venerated cenobites lived in the monastery: one called *Ekonomius*, the other *Lampadius*. One day *Ekonomius* came to the Abbot and expounded his case. "My life grieveth me," he complained, "because Brother *Lampadius* insists upon turning on the lightning jars. Dozens of times a day do I turn them off; and ever cometh *Lampadius* and switcheth them on again. What a waste! What a waste! Discipline him, Father Abbot, and we shall live in peace."

Sending for *Lampadius* the Abbot asked for his side of the story. "My life tormenteth me," said *Lampadius*. "Brother *Ekonomius* insists upon turning off the lightning jars every time that I turn them on; and dozens of times a day must I switch them on again, because the devil walks in darkness, and will take the occasion to push the monks headlong down the stairs. What disaster, what disaster! Restrain his madness, Father Abbot, and we shall live in peace."

The Abbot groaned, and rent his robe, or pallium. Cost of lightning jars vs. cost of doctors' bills! Did Paul the Protoeremite have such cares, or St. Ephraim of Edessa? "God hath punished me, brothers," he exclaimed, "for my alphabetical pride. Henceforth I shall be named not Aaron but *Zyzygius*, and shall be last in the abbatial procession!" The following night saw the *Laura* again illumined by rushes and wicks floating in olive oil, save for a mysterious blue aura that shone upon the midnight vigils of humble Abbot *Zyzygius*.

THE Pilgrim, having heard the foregoing story, sought to confirm it by examination of the illuminated manuscripts from the Pierpont Morgan Library, which are on exposition at the New York City Public Library until February 28 of this year. Careful scrutiny showed no trace of the Abbot *Zyzygius*, but it did reveal marvels of art and craftsmanship more thrilling than his lightning jars. What a place of honor the book held in the early Middle Ages! Nothing was too precious, in time, workmanship, sheer riches of gold, silver, and jewels, to lavish on it. Talk of symmetallism! Dear man, Mr. Morgan, look at your silver-and-gold-encased Gospels! Naturally the visitor raves over the Ashburnham Gospels, with their gorgeous wrought and jeweled cover. They were written and illuminated in the monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland; and the lower cover, of pure Celtic design, was probably executed at St. Gall between 825 and 850, the work of Irish hands.

Are these *old* books? They are old chronologically; but that is all. Colors are as bright today as eight or nine centuries ago. The writing is modern: bold, decisive, masterful. Stop at the Greek manuscripts, and study the

"Materia Medica," by Dioscorides, a manuscript of the tenth century. Those botanical paintings, from the heart of the Dark Ages, are as exact and systematic as the finest illustrations in the *National Geographic*.

There is that delightful oddity, the Greek Letter of Abgarus, on a long, narrow roll, with its quaint illustrations showing the Saviour as He receives the legendary letter, and Abgarus writing it. There is the French manuscript of scenes from the Old Testament, which, says the catalogue, was presented in 1604 to Shah Abbas the Great of Persia. The Shah directed that the meaning of the pictures should be written in Persian under each one. There is the "Golden Latin Gospels of Henry VIII," in which the entire text is written in gold upon purple-dyed vellum, and is said to have been given to that old sinner by Pope Leo X. Fifteen of the manuscripts are secular.

**D**ID our laity more generally have the Church Latin, how much closer would be our sense of possession of these ancient treasures of Christendom! Kathryn Hair, in *AMERICA's* Communications of last week, told a welcome story of the wonderful work that Marywood College and the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary of Scranton, Pa., are doing for the restoration of popular singing of the chant of the Holy Mass. At Buenos Aires, in preparation for the next International Eucharistic Congress, under Father Rubin, O.S.B., Argentinians are already practising the chant of the Church.

Again let me note that Church Latin may be advantageously studied from such manuals as the two published by Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, by J. E. Lowe, M.A., "Church Latin for Beginners," and "Folia Latina: An Easy Latin Primer," each equipped with a convenient "key." Good use can thus be made of leisure time.

**A**GAIN the New Year brings around, for the thirty-second time, the annual issue of the Bulletin of St. Ansgar's Scandinavian League of New York: this year got out the best ever as to size, illustrations, and make-up. The Rev. Knud Wessely-Maribo, C.S.S.R., a Dane, contributes an article on the Church in Iceland. The story is told of Wadstena and the Brigittine Order of Sweden, by Carl-Axel Selvin. It is consoling to know that even today St. Bridget's old monastery is still used as a hospital, hence not wholly profaned. Her Order was a double Order both of monks and nuns: each convent had sixty choir nuns and four lay Sisters, thirteen priests, four deacons, and eight lay Brothers, all under an Abbess, who was supreme in temporal affairs, being called Sovereign, while the Prior was supreme in spiritual. The monks sang their Hours before the nuns; the seculars entered the abbey church by the door of remission, the Fathers and monks by the door of reconciliation, and the nuns by that of glory. Who says the Nordics had no imagination? If you want to learn more of this, and of what the League is doing today, write for a copy of the Bulletin, which will be sent to you free by Arthur Andersen, Secretary, 435 Seventy-sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE PILGRIM.

## Dramatics

### The New Plays

ELIZABETH JORDAN

**E**UGENE O'NEILL has subtitled his new drama, "Days Without End," "A Miracle Play." As produced this month by the Theater Guild, at the Henry Miller Theater, the sole miracle of the play seems on first view the fact that Eugene O'Neill has conceived and written it. Yet, on reflection, this is easily explained. Beyond a doubt, "Days Without End" is, in part at least, the author's personal experience. Beyond a doubt, he himself has passed through most, if not all, of his hero's spiritual struggles. For Eugene O'Neill has been for years a lost child in the wilderness of life. Born within the safe fold of the Catholic church, he either left it voluntarily, as his hero did, or unconsciously strayed away from it. He has been a bewildered and desperately unhappy pilgrim, longing for home. In "Days Without End" he has come home, bringing his genius to lay at the foot of the altar as an offering and an expiation.

It is a great offering. Every member of the Catholic clergy who has seen the new play, and countless members have, seems thrilled by the soundness of the playwright's theology and the power of his work. Thrilled, too, are the vast majority of other enlightened spectators.

But not all spectators are theologians. Not all have standards. Not all are intelligent. A few Broadway laymen can neither understand nor appreciate the mighty conflict which is the basis of the new O'Neill drama, and it is from their slender ranks that the sole criticism of the play comes. For this drama turns on the greatest of all themes, the fight between man's higher and his lower nature, and his search for God. It is the most terrible struggle one can experience, the most thrilling one can watch. But a handful of world-weary spectators, not concerned with their souls, not flaming with the passion to make their peace with God, watch the play in puzzled wonder. They are deeply interested, despite themselves; yet they cannot fully respond to a message they cannot comprehend. Neither, perhaps, can they understand why the hero of the play, briefly unfaithful to his beloved wife, sees in this infidelity the final wreckage of his marriage and his hopes of salvation. That philosophy is indeed new and strange to Broadway.

Impressed by the majesty of the theme, unwilling to admit that they cannot follow it, the members of this little band shake their heads doubtfully and pronounce the play "talky." It is talky. Mr. O'Neill has become a propagandist, almost but never completely carried away by his theme. His talk is marvelous talk to hearing ears, and the open-minded spectator follows it with tense absorption. The blasé spectator who is looking for incessant thrills, and who is used to getting them from Mr. O'Neill, becomes increasingly confused. He responds eagerly to "the big moments"; but not till the end of the play does he really get his great thrill. Then it comes upon him with such a titanic rush that he is almost as much dazed



as he is thrilled. Intelligent or otherwise, no spectator with a normal brain can follow that scene unmoved. It lifts the heart and fires the soul.

After Father Donnelly's masterly theological review of "Days Without End" in the issue of AMERICA for January 13, I need not go into details of plot or construction. As a theologian O'Neill is sound and deeply impressive. As a writer he gives us some of the best dialogue he has ever written. Much of this comes from the lips of the Catholic priest who is the finest character in the drama.

No theater goer can afford to miss the new O'Neill play. Least of all can Catholics afford to miss it. Every Catholic will find in it a deep joy and a lasting inspiration. It is safe to predict, too, that the amount of theological talk in the play itself will be greatly exceeded by the amount of talk concerning it that will be heard around New York's luncheon and dinner tables this season. To be discussing their souls, and the relation of those souls to their Creator, will be a new and uplifting experience to our so-called intelligentsia!

Two of our most inspiring and inspired producers—and I need hardly add that they are Guthrie McClintic and Jed Harris—have brightened New York's holiday season with two very big and ambitious new offerings. The preliminary acclaim over these was deeply impressive. Rarely have we heard such far-reaching notes of silver trumpets as those which echoed from the dramatic hills before "The Lake" and "Jezebel" came to town.

It was superb advertising and it was supported by most of the facts. But it put the critics and the public into the judgment seat. Briskly climbing into this together, they set their jaws and demanded to be shown whether all the preliminary excitement was justified by the new offerings. That mood made the dramatic going of the two productions very difficult for the producers, the plays, and the players. We humans are a queer lot. Assured that we are going to see something simply marvelous, we desire to prove that marvels are no new experience to us. Also we are subject to a few obsessions. One of these is that moving-picture stars are never at their best in the spoken drama. Another is that the habitual enthusiast is never a good critic. The third obsession is that it is more fun to criticize than to praise. An immense amount of dramatic criticism is colored by these three ideas. Critics, and the public, too, like to discover things for themselves. They like to attend a first night, knowing little about the attraction it offers, and then go out into the world to spread the glad tidings that they have found something very fine. The producer who acclaims his offering too loudly is inviting trouble. The one who thrusts his finger into his mouth, and backs away muttering shyly, "Come and see my little play," is the lad who represents preparedness. All of which, though you may not think it, brings us right back to "The Lake" and "Jezebel," and the excitement that preceded and the varied opinions that followed their respective openings.

"The Lake," written by Dorothy Massingham and Murray MacDonald, produced and personally directed by Jed Harris at the Martin Beck Theater, came to us with

the prestige of a London success. For the star role in it Mr. Harris lured from Hollywood no less a personage than Katharine Hepburn, whose recent success in "Little Women" and other moving pictures has been highly spectacular and wholly deserved. To support Miss Hepburn he engaged a superb company, with Frances Starr and Blanche Bates at the head of the list. He had the settings made by Jo Melzinger, and for weeks before the production Mr. Harris gave all his time and his great ability to the details of the offering.

The public rose to the occasion with a tremendous demand for seats. Gossip has it that the theater is sold out for every performance for the coming two months, and that the receipts of the second week's sale were more than \$20,000. Everybody who had seen Miss Hepburn in "Little Women," and the entire theater-going public evidently had seen her, wanted to see her as a star in the spoken drama. Her first night was one of the biggest on Broadway during the past decade.

But neither audience nor critics made any allowance for Miss Hepburn's comparative inexperience in the medium. Neither allowed for her inevitable nervousness. They expected the same ease, the same assurance, the same extraordinary glamour she gives them on the silver screen. If she had crept into New York silently and wearing rubbers, as it were, they might have thrown up their hats. As it was, they didn't, though they may do so yet. For the production is a superb one, the play itself is reasonably good, though not excessively so, the acting of the company is about perfect, and Miss Hepburn herself, with her magnetism working on all twelve cylinders, is nightly settling more comfortably into her role.

Practically the same things may be said about Mr. McClintic's production of Owen Davis's play "Jezebel," at the Ethel Barrymore Theater, in which another famous picture actress, Miriam Hopkins, is starred. Like Miss Hepburn, Miss Hopkins has had some preliminary experience in the spoken drama. She has great beauty and an enormous following. She is a delight to the eye, and her acting is really admirable. But "Jezebel," like "The Lake," is merely a play that has its moments, its moments and its holes! Guthrie McClintic did for it all that was humanly possible. He directed it himself, and he has no superior in modern stage direction. He engaged a fine supporting company, including Cora Witherspoon, Reed Browne, and Owen Davis, Jr. The setting of the play was almost as beautiful as the star herself. But not Bernhardt or Eleanora Duse could have won sympathy for "Jezebel." She is a tiger cat and more, and every audience is shocked by her goings on. She, too, may conquer yet. Certainly Miss Hopkins' devoted "fans" are flocking to the Ethel Barrymore Theater in impressive numbers.

"The Dark Tower," produced at the Morosco Theater by another inspired producer, Sam H. Harris (and now taken off), was interesting first of all because of its authors, Alexander Woolcott and George S. Kaufman; but to me the real excitement of the opening night lay in the discovery that Basil Sidney could really act. I had

never seen him do it before. I had seen him pose, and posture, and play to the gallery. But in "The Dark Tower" he did such unusual work that he could almost carry the play, even without the strong support of his associates. I make him a deep and apologetic obeisance.

The first two acts of "Big-Hearted Herbert," a comedy by Anna Steese Richardson and Sophie Kerr, produced at the Biltmore by Eddie Dowling, were built with a trowel. So heavy-handed is the work that it almost wrecks a capital and uproariously amusing third act. Almost, but not quite. Audiences leave the theater with merry chortles. They are still chortling when they reach the street, and probably most of them have forgotten all about the play's rather dreary first act, and greatly over-done second act. Even J. C. Nugent, who plays the leading role to perfection, cannot save that over-written second act. But the third act is so funny that it alone is well worth a journey to the Biltmore. "Big-Hearted Herbert" is a clean play, too, of the sort the young folks will greatly enjoy. Possibly the first act will be re-written and the second greatly toned down. The company supporting Mr. Nugent deserves a vehicle that is good throughout, for beginning with Elizabeth Risdon as the mother, and ending with young David Morris as a twelve-year-old lad (and a coming figure on our stage), it could hardly be better. Granting that, the play calls aloud for immediate and thorough revision. Given this, it ought to linger with us all season.

"Half-Way to Hell," produced at the Fulton Theater by Elizabeth Miele, is the unpleasant title of a better melodrama than that title would suggest. Its plot is not conventional. An old sea pirate, finding that he is about to die in his home on a Pacific Island, not too far from the coast, sends for his eight heirs, to brighten his passing. They come, and a sorry lot they are, greedy, uncharitable, full of venom. Only two of them are passable human beings. At once Murder stalks among them, and the drama is on. It is quick moving, reasonably thrilling, and the climax is a complete surprise. At least, it was a surprise to me, though the young man who sat behind me assured his girl friend that he had known from the start exactly what it would be. She was thrilled by the play and even more thrilled by the young man; so of course he had to say that!

#### REVIEWS

**A Romance of Lady Poverty.** By the REV. CELESTINE N. BITTLE, O.M.CAP. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company.

The Diamond Jubilee of the Province of St. Joseph of the Capuchin Order prompts the publication of this history with an Introduction by Dr. Peter Guilday. On September 2, 1856, Fathers Gregory Haas and John Frey, two Swiss secular priests, landed in New York, determined to transplant to Wisconsin the religious community "which was most popular in Switzerland—the Capuchin Order." Arrived at Mt. Calvary, a focal point of German immigration in the hills east of Lake Winnebago, the two pioneer priests began the erection of their monastery. The early days were beset with cold, privation and hardship. Sister Petra and her Sisters of Notre Dame furnished indispensable help. While Father Haas traveled, begging funds, Father Frey built. Internal dissension and the difficulty of securing proper authorization from Superiors in Rome clouded the outlook for many painful months.

Finally, in 1864, official recognition was granted and Mt. Calvary became a Commissariat, with Father Francis (Father Haas) as the first Commissary. There followed foundations at Milwaukee and New York City. In 1870, Father Francis reorganized the the Congregation of St. Agnes, a religious community of women. The year 1882 brought Provincial status and the first Provincial Chapter. The next year saw the foundation of St. Bonaventure's Monastery, Detroit, the present Provincial headquarters. Additional parishes were accepted in New York City, Yonkers, Brooklyn, and Milwaukee. In Milwaukee, the St. Benedict the Moor Colored Mission developed rapidly. Everywhere devotion to the Sacred Heart was sedulously cultivated. Small wonder that the General of the Order could describe the American Province as outstanding in "spirit" and "buildings." Father Francis, elected Definitor General, found the climate of Rome too trying and obtained leave of absence. He died at his beloved Mt. Calvary in 1895. His Province went on to new triumphs, entering the missionary field among the Indians of Montana. In the last two decades the Province has entered more and more upon extra-monastic work and social action. The whole story is told by Father Bittle with painstaking accuracy and no little literary skill. He has made a valuable contribution to the history of the American spiritual frontier. Although the index is sketchy, there is a remarkably full as well as clear table of contents. The Bruce Publishing Company has produced another competent printing work, in which the illustrations are not the least feature. J. F. T.

**Monsieur Vincent.** Par PIERRE COSTE, Prêtre de la Mission. Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. Three volumes, paper, 90 francs.

The appearance of an authentic life of a great Saint is always an event; particularly so when the Saint is *Le grand saint du grand siècle*: "the great Saint of the great era," as St. Vincent de Paul is appropriately called in the subtitle of this work. In his foreword to Father Coste's great work, Cardinal Verdier, the Archbishop of Paris, terms this biography a "monument," worthy of the title that Horace applied to his own immortal works. Eleven years of diligent labor have been applied to it, which were preceded by many more years of preparation and collection, during which time Father Coste published much documentary material. Twenty fine-printed pages of bibliography, are given. The illustrations are well-chosen and of historical interest. The author aims primarily not at devotion but at history; complete, critical, serious; with the result, however, that history itself edifies. Vincent de Paul is studied from the most comprehensive point of view—and what a sweep it is! Hardly any life in the story of the Church offers a happier hunting ground for a biographer. The foundation of the Congregation of the Mission; of the Daughters of Charity; of the Ladies of Charity; the reform of the clergy; the confraternities; the foreign missions; the retreats for seminarians and the clergy; the reform of preaching; reform of the episcopate; of the mendicant Orders; the work for the prisoners and the galley slaves, the orphans, the insane, the country children and rural schools—what a bewildering array! What a picture of the conditions of the times, when in the Diocese of Langres, in 1615, some 200 priests were ordained under age; when hardly two parish priests could be found who celebrated Mass in the same manner; when preachers larded their sermons with classical allusions. What forces Vincent coped with—the devastations of war; the conflicting ambitions of worldly ecclesiastics, the Court, the Jansenists, and countless other tests of his faith and patience! His relations with St. Cyran are worth the reading of the three volumes alone. Father Coste has earned our gratitude. His work should be translated into English. J. L. F.

**Art and Artifice in Shakespeare.** By E. E. STOLL. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

Here is a well-knit study of Shakespeare's characteristic technique as illustrated particularly in the four great tragedies, Othello,



Macbeth, Hamlet, and Lear. The author is probably the greatest Shakespearean critic since Bradley; certainly he is the best known spokesman of the historical method which insists on interpreting the great dramatist as he was understood by his Elizabethan audience rather than by the impression he makes on modern psychologists. People who have read Stoll's earlier studies, especially his monographs on Othello and Hamlet, will recognize familiar ideas in the present work, but they will appreciate them better for their comparison with classical and modern dicta on the drama, and their situation in a general synthesis. The unifying thesis of the book is that the core of all drama is not character but situation. Shakespeare, thoroughly in this tradition, did not aim at psychological verisimilitude so much as good theater, i.e., a dramatic illusion with emotional effect. On this basis, many of the so-called riddles of Shakespeare, such as the hesitation of Hamlet, the gullibility of Othello, become a matter of theatrical convention, for one reason or another expected by the audience, and hence not to be closely scrutinized for deep human motivation. The arguments marshaled for this view are impressive; they will doubtless decimate the already fast thinning ranks of the Shakespeare idolaters, but for many of us they will not down the lingering doubt that perhaps after all Shakespeare was not quite so simple. As admittedly he surpassed his contemporaries in the gift of the word, why may he not also have gone beyond them in knowledge of the devious ways of the human heart? It is to be regretted that a style overburdened with parentheses, and not entirely free from Germanisms, makes the book difficult, and at times exasperating beyond its content. But the patient student will be stimulated to a deeper analysis of Shakespeare, the man, as well as his art and technique.

A. C. S.

**From Dante to Jeanne d'Arc: Adventures in Medieval Life and Letters.** By KATHERINE BRÉGY, Litt.D. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company. \$1.75.

There is something so deft and delicate in the weaving of Miss Brégy's "Adventures" that one is apt to forget that they constitute not merely literature but history. Literature these little essays are, primarily; and that by the double title of their form and subject matter. This is particularly true of the treatment of Tristram and of the Holy Grail; and, of course, too, of the well-known essay on "Dante's Dream of Life," which won the Leahy prize in 1927. This last is a work of rare merit; it is an extraordinarily successful attempt to tell in an incredibly short space both the very long tale of the Dream and the immense meaning of Dante the man. (However, I except from praise the unfortunate paragraph on the "De Monarchia." It is forgivable in a poetess to go a little astray in dealing with a political philosopher; but those words *intellectually obsolete*, *fanatical fulminations*, and *sheer political propaganda* are in need of revision.) In many ways the adventures in Life have been as fruitful as those in Letters. Particularly is this true of the papers on Bunyan and Jeanne d'Arc. They reveal a mature historical sense, the power, that is, to perceive the new threads that enter into the changing patterns in the tapestry of time. Dr. Brégy obviously understands, better than most of the professional historians, what was wrong with Bunyan and his age. "One turns back with a sigh to the wholesome, unstudied sanity of the pre-Reformation standards. Excesses of imagination there were indubitably throughout the great Middle Ages, and excesses of conduct, too; but the sources of life were sound. And the England of Catholic discipline, of vigil and holiday, was the only merry England the world has ever known." So, too, is it with Jeanne d'Arc. The real meaning of the Maid—as the mere historian sees meaning—is perceived through the mist of romance. "Almost unique in history was this peasant girl's balance of action and vision, of pride and humility, of strength and tenderness." Wholeness and balance are at the very roots of the medieval Order, and in these days of disintegration both in life and letters, it is not the least of Miss Brégy's merits to have helped to reveal that Order.

G. G. W.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Sociology.**—North Carolina was the first State in the Union to establish a Division of Work among Negroes, in its State Board of Charities. Through this Division capable Negro leaders have been organized to aid the poor, the unfortunate, and the orphans of their race. The activities of Lieut. Lawrence A. Oxley, Director of this Division, led to the making of a survey, with the aid of the late Julius Rosenwald, which would serve as a basis for working out a program for the care of the delinquent and defective Negro children in North Carolina. The results of this survey directed by Wiley Britton Sanders, Ph.D., are embodied in a publication of the University of North Carolina, entitled "Negro Child Welfare in North Carolina" (University of North Carolina Press. Cloth: \$1.00, Paper: 50 cents). Beside the case studies of individual children, which are valuable because of the careful follow-up in later years, there are studies of the various State educational and charitable institutions in this field. Dr. Sanders and his collaborators are to be congratulated on their excellent work.

Although published in the midst of the 1932 Presidential campaign, Walter Frier Dexter's defense of "Herbert Hoover and American Individualism" (Macmillan. \$2.00) may still have a certain timeliness, but only as an exposition of the political and economic system under which certain people piled up for themselves huge profits, as connected with the investigation into the methods of private bankers now being conducted by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Catholics will hardly agree with the author's concept of "rugged individualism," which Pius XI has placed on the same plane as Communism.

In a handy little volume, "Mystery, Magic, and Medicine," (Doubleday, Doran. \$1.00), Dr. Howard W. Haggard tells in familiar terms the progress of the science of medicine from ancient superstitions to the modern ascendancy of medical skill. A glossary of proper names and medical terms adds to its usefulness.

**Reference Books.**—Not only librarians but all lovers of modern literature will welcome the handsome volume "Authors Today and Yesterday" (H. W. Wilson. \$5.00), edited by Stanley Kunitz with the assistance of Howard Haycroft and W. C. Hadden. Supplementing that successful "Living Authors" produced in 1931, this volume reaches out for all the writers not included in the first, with the aim that these two volumes will give complete data of living and dead authors of the literature of the twentieth century. Again a portrait accompanies each biography, and the information is made accurate and human by the assistance of the authors themselves in many cases. The bibliographies, including translations of foreign works, are invaluable. The book is beautifully printed and bound in strong cloth. For such an aid to the students of literature the Wilson Company deserves the gratitude and applause of all book lovers.

With all the shifting of the past and even of the present one constantly feels the need of an up-to-date manual for the correct writing and pronouncing of proper names which cover the pages of the daily papers and occur constantly in literature and travel. C. O. Sylvester Mawson has prepared with the greatest care and accuracy such a valuable help in "International Book of Names" (Crowell. \$2.00). In one alphabetical sequence, names in every field of knowledge are listed with the pronunciation clearly indicated and a note of identification. It is no mere compilation from old gazetteers but an original work in which the compiler endeavored to verify the best present usage. It will be needed for reading, conversation, and travel.

"The Irish Jesuit Directory and Year Book" (Irish Messenger, Dublin. 1/6) is more than a listing of Jesuits of the Irish Province, with records of their schools and colleges. It contains an instructive liturgical calendar, interesting information including statistics, biographies, and stories, of the Missions, and general information on the Jesuit Saints and Beati. It is an edifying book that should be very useful in Catholic homes.

### The Testament of Youth. Madame Clapain. Red Rhapsody.

Vera Brittain's "Testament of Youth" (Macmillan. \$2.50) is a lengthy autobiographical novel by one of that "lost generation" who were stripped of their ideals in the heart-breaking years of the World War. The writer portrays herself as an ambitious middle-class English girl whose studies at Oxford are interrupted by the call to arms. When her fiancé and brother are killed, she enlists as a nurse and serves her country in the hospitals of London, Malta, and France. All this has been better told before. But we should be grateful to Miss Brittain for her discerning story of the return of the "outcasts" to Oxford, of her travels in behalf of the League of Nations, of the obstacles she valiantly overcame in becoming a feminist, writer, and public speaker. There is restraint, beauty, and a deep melancholy in this opus of 600 pages that carries the reader through from first to last. Its sadness is caused by the dual situation which confronted so many youths of that unhappy generation. On the one hand were their high ideals, aspirations, and the supreme confidence they had in their education to carry them through every conflict; and on the other were the slings and arrows of a fortune so outrageous that they found themselves without the stamina necessary to resist the onslaught. Their education, divorced from Christianity, was a light that failed. The depths of despair into which they fell is revealed in a discussion of death which contrasts the views of Robert Hugh Benson and Bertrand Russell. It concludes with these significant words: "Both passages are beautiful, and Benson's has a faith and mysticism which Russell's lacks; but if I were to suffer the same loss today, it would be in Russell, and not in Benson, that I should find courage and comfort." Though ably, honestly, and in passages even poignantly written, this book never quite gets below the surface of its subject and thus does not square with its title. The Testament of Youth for the World War period has not yet been written.

The author of the mystery story, "Madame Clapain," (Appleton-Century. \$2.50) by Edouard Estaunié, is a member of the French Academy and a member of the Society of Men of Letters. Perhaps it is due to such membership that this story is inadequate as a "thriller." The Cadifon sisters, two old maiden ladies, belong to the Grand Hotel decade, because in their lives "nothing ever happens." That is, until, because of low finances, they accept a boarder, Madame Clapain. They know nothing of her, and when in the course of slow-moving events she commits suicide, the sisters as well as the police seek a motive. This story is built upon the age-old Madame X theme. It is typically un-American in speed. If we but could begin to read at the end, Madame Clapain may prove to be an interesting personality, but as it is, her hovering over the story in sinister fashion, may classify this as psychological mystery, but certainly not an exciting one. The readers of modern fiction are a patient lot. They will stand for many of the diverting digressions of the psychoanalyst writers, but they wish their heroes and heroines to move with decision and speed, to stand out from the printed pages of their novels as living, not ghostly personalities.

Almost half of the mystery-detective stories that have come out during the past year have as their setting a murder taking place either actually in the midst of a select gathering, or in a house, servants of course excluded, where the same select few are living at the time. Each and every one of them have an apparent or secret motive for doing away with the victim, and generally speaking the reader can pick the murderer because he is the least likely to have committed the crime. All this is by way of introduction to "Red Rhapsody" (Stokes. \$2.00). It is a Cortland Fitzsimmons mystery, but unfortunately it is far below the standard of his best. At certain times of the year the presses grind out hundreds of books for holiday consumption, and it looks as if pressure is brought to bear upon well-known and prolific authors to produce a volume for these occasions. The result is that their work is not much better than "hack" writing, just "words, my Lord, words."

## Communications

*Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.*

### Catholics and the Films

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I heartily agree with J. B. in his communication on "Catholics and the Films" in the issue of AMERICA for December 30. I believe that when we Catholics demand that objectionable features and false teaching on morality be kept from the theater, we are perfectly within our rights. But I also believe that in so doing we are only going part way. We should be just as active in promoting attendance at decent and clean pictures.

Our people have a right to some entertainment and will attend the movies in spite of all our warnings against them. Should we simply keep quiet and let them use their uncritical judgment as to what is lawful and what is unlawful for them to attend, we would act the part of the unfaithful shepherd. Should we simply decry all forms of entertainment including all movies we would become as the "voice of one crying in the wilderness"; no one would pay any heed to us.

Now I believe it the duty of priests exercising the care of souls to point out not only the sin committed in attending evil movies, but also to recommend such movies as are known to be good clean entertainment. But when such a charming and beautiful film as "Cradle Song" is presented to the general public, I think its producers deserve the support and encouragement of every Catholic. No one could see that film and not be the better for it. As AMERICA stated recently, "If such films fail, Catholics will have much to answer for." Well, from all accounts it will fail.

In this parish we have a Catholic Action Club which is composed of unmarried young men and women. In our monthly publication *Actionews*, which reaches a thousand homes, we have a section, "At the Theater," in which we recommend good movies. "Cradle Song" was listed as excellent.

Minneapolis.

(REV.) JAMES R. COLEMAN.

### Canadian Catholic Universities

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the issue of AMERICA for November 18 you have the following comment: "The [Canadian] bishops pledged their combined efforts to further the plan for a complete English-speaking Catholic university in Kingston which would become the center of Catholic thought and action."

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that there are in Canada Catholic universities. There is Laval, one of the oldest institutions in America. There is the University of Montreal. Both these universities receive thousands of students every year and both are Catholic. These universities have a complete curriculum. They are open to students of all nationalities. Besides the above mentioned there are other universities of Catholic Faith. Antigonish (St. Francis Xavier), St. Joseph's, Ottawa, are recognized institutions labeled as universities.

Those institutions have for more than fifty years been centers of Catholic thought and action. They will be glad, I am sure, to welcome a new university at Kingston which will, let us hope, humbly take its place in the kingdom of science without ignoring the work and efforts of past generations.

St. Boniface, Manitoba.

A. D'ESCHAMBAULT, D.D.

### Closer Co-operation Needed

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Several years ago there appeared in AMERICA an interesting article on the need of closer co-operation between Catholics in this country. Although we are united by a common faith, yet the



racial and political lines are keeping us apart to some extent, resulting in a lack of that friendly, co-operative spirit so essential in meeting the problems confronting us today.

To cite an example: In the field of education it often happens that a community largely Catholic will have finely-equipped public schools, while the parish schools are able to accommodate only about fifty per cent of the children in the primary grades and even less in the secondary. As citizens we draw no ward or precinct lines when educational needs are considered, but, strange to say, as Catholics we are indifferent or even opposed to pooling our forces and resources in order to be able to give the other fifty per cent the opportunity of acquiring a Christian education.

While on this subject of education, another point should be brought out, namely, the importance of getting our non-Catholic fellow citizens to see the necessity of revising our public-school system. We cannot do this by standing aloof and saying, in effect, "Leave us alone," while at the same time we criticize an educational system that has no place for religion or morality.

It seems to me that a plan of action is needed that will bring Catholic and non-Catholic together in friendly discussion, looking to the adoption of a system similar to that of Canada and Great Britain. That may appear to be an objective very far off, but a start must be made sometime if we ever hope to attain it. It is a matter that should have been discussed and acted upon years ago.

We should not be in a defensive position. I believe we can convince those outside the Fold that we are not actuated by selfish or ulterior motives but rather by a spirit of patriotism and love of neighbor in that we look to the welfare of the individual, the family, and our common country.

Springfield, Mass.

RICHARD LENZI.

### Oral Reading

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article on oral reading, by Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., in the issue of AMERICA for December 9 is worthy of widespread dissemination among teachers of English in junior and senior high schools. I specify these schools because it is in these grades—from the seventh to the twelfth—that silent reading is emphasized and oral reading minimized, if not entirely eliminated. There is something to say, however, in defense of the English teachers of these grades. They are often harassed by the lack of time in the program to do all the things they would like to do. With one forty or fifty-minute period a day assigned to the entire English program, it is hard to find time for oral reading. Composition, grammar, punctuation, spelling, dictation, and reading for content and appreciation simply crowd out any chance for systematized oral reading. But, even with this lack of time, thoughtful teachers do attempt at least an occasional exercise in this old-fashioned accomplishment.

In the elementary grades oral reading is still quite generally stressed, and is quite well done. But the neglect in the high school years brings students to college with the inability which so astounds Father Hartnett. Another factor which has hurt oral reading, is the emphasis on so-called reading tests, which stress content entirely and give no credit for oral expression.

Two things should be done, in my opinion. First, in the higher grades, more time should be allotted to English. Then some oral reading can be done. Next, school authorities should insist on a certain skill in expression as a part of the English requirements. Then some oral reading will be done.

In the Washington Irving Junior High School, in Boston, of which school I have the honor to be Principal, we are about to inaugurate a campaign in systematized oral reading. We are doing this because, in assembly programs and in other extra-curricular work, we have found a deplorable inability among the pupils to speak clearly, distinctly, and audibly. I shall take the liberty of quoting your splendid article to my teachers, in support of the need for this work.

Boston.

WILLIAM T. MILLER.

### "A New Food and Drugs Act"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I am informed that my article, "A New Food and Drugs Act," is already in print. Since it is therefore too late to revise it, I wish to point out some recent developments.

A revised bill (S. 2000) has been introduced in the Senate by Mr. Copeland. It contains several important changes which definitely weaken it from the consumers' viewpoint.

It sets up two committees, one on Public Health and one on Food, each with five non-political members appointed by the President. The approval of three members out of five must be secured by the Secretary of Agriculture for almost every important regulation he may desire to impose. For instance, he is not permitted to add to the list of diseases which drugs may not be advertised as affecting, although he may make exemptions with the permission of the Committee on Public Health. He is unable to set up quality standards for foods, but only minimum standards (which, as with minimum wages, tend to become maximum standards), subject to the permission of the Committee on Foods.

The definition of false advertising has been weakened.

Patent medicines need not disclose their formula on the label. Instead of stating that a medicine is "not a cure" for diseases mentioned, it is only necessary to bear a "plain and conspicuous statement" that it is "a palliative and how the palliation is affected." This brings to mind the liquor advertisements containing the very-small-type statements that they are not intended for States where sale or advertising of liquor is unlawful.

The revised bill presents a compromise between consumers' interests and those of the more tangibly represented opposition lobbies. It appears to have the characteristics of many compromises—neither affording full protection to the consumer, which is bad; nor giving manufacturing and allied interests the unlimited "individualism" they would like to have, which is good.

New York.

FLOYD ANDERSON.

### Labor Unions as Idols

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Weirton, W. Va., where the Weirton Steel Company has its chief manufacturing plant is situated on the other side of the Ohio river, opposite Steubenville, Ohio. The Weirton Steel Company has also a tin mill in Steubenville, but it has been idle a long time and in consequence most of the Steubenville tin workers were allowed to labor at Weirton part of the time each week prior to the promulgation of the NRA.

Scarcely had the Weirton Steel Company signed with the NRA and commenced to operate at increased wages on a larger scale to the delight of the workers themselves and business men in general, when the Amalgamated Iron, Tin, and Metal Workers Union called forth a strike which lasted a month with the purpose of unionizing all the workers at the steel plant by threats and intimidation.

You speak derisively in your editorials of the company union. But are there not strong industrial unions beyond the pale of the American Federation of Labor? Just why should the NRA discriminate against the manufacturer and give all rights and privileges to an irresponsible labor demagogue?

It is my impression that the NRA has done enough when it opened the eyes of the manufacturer to his duty in regard to the betterment of the laborer, and that the company union will do as well in industrial disputes as any labor board set up by the Government.

There are those nowadays, of course, who regard their labor union as a sort of idol. It is not! Did not the workers of idols yell for hours in behalf of Diana when St. Paul was about to address them? Yet the great Diana is no more.

Labor leaders will do well to train and educate their members, to provide for periods of unemployment and old age, and above all they should mind the decalogue.

Steubenville, O.

(REV.) C. SMOGOR.

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—In a special message on January 15, President Roosevelt asked Congress to vest title in the Treasury of all the monetary gold in the country, including the stocks of the Federal Reserve Banks, which amounted to \$3,600,000,000. He also requested authority to revalue the dollar, on the basis of its present gold content, at not more than sixty cents nor less than fifty cents, and to be able to change its value within this range as often as necessary to keep its purchasing power from varying. He asked that the dollar profits on the gold stocks of \$2,000,000,000 be set aside for use as an equalization fund to steady the dollar on international exchange and to support Government bonds. (The dollar profit was estimated at from \$3,500,000,000 to \$4,500,000,000.) On January 16, Senators Glass and McAdoo, both former Secretaries of the Treasury, protested as unconstitutional the seizure by the Treasury of the profit on gold held by the Federal Reserve System. On the next day, Attorney General Cummings laid before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee an opinion that the President's plan was constitutional in every respect. He said that under the right of eminent domain, the Government could take over any property required for the public use, and that to impound the gold for monetary purposes was for a public service. The bill giving the President the legislation he desired was introduced in both the Senate and the House. On January 11, the Administration withstood what many considered its first legislative test. The House, by the narrow margin of 197 to 192, passed a special "gag rule" governing debate on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill. On the same day, the Senate passed the liquor-tax bill (with the foreign debt-default penalty eliminated), it was approved by the House, and on January 12 President Roosevelt signed it. Also on January 12, the House passed the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill. On January 15, the Senate and House passed and sent to the President the Administration bill extending the loan power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation until February 1, 1935, and increasing its lending power by \$850,000,000. On January 16, the House accepted the President's plan of having the Government guarantee the principal of \$2,000,000,000 in farm-refinancing bonds. Controller General McCarl gave an opinion on January 16 that expenditures by the Federal Housing Corporation without his own approval would be unconstitutional. On January 17, in his press conference, the President stated that no holder of a high political office should practise law in Washington. In recent months, three members of the Democratic National Committee practising law in Washington have resigned. Six United States Navy planes on January 11 successfully completed a record formation flight of 2,400 miles from San Francisco to Honolulu in 24 hours, 56 minutes. On January 12, Robert H. Gore resigned as Governor of Puerto Rico because of poor health.

**Reorganization of Communist Control.**—After sixteen years of continual and insistent denial that any connection existed between the interlocking Soviet Government and the Communist party, the "fiction," according to the Moscow correspondent of the *New York Times*, would be definitely abandoned in the sweeping changes that were planned in preparation for the seventeenth congress of the Russian Communist party opening January 25. The program was being prepared by L. M. Kaganovich, secretary of the Moscow Communist party's committee and close collaborator of Joseph Stalin. Two new committees would be created: a committee of party control and a committee of Soviet control which would be given sweeping powers over the selection of governing personnel and come as a climax in the process of drastic centralization which has been going on in Soviet Russia during the more recent years of the Stalin regime.

**United States Soviet Claims.**—American claims against Russia were reported from Washington to have been placed at \$623,000,000. This would include United States Government loans, old Russian bonds privately held, private American claims. Accrued interest (\$139,908,590) was not included. The claims, it was stated, must be settled before any credits could be granted, and no buying of American goods could occur without credits.

**Cuba Swings to the Right.**—By a swift succession of events—President Grau's resignation on January 15, his replacement for two days by President Carlos Hevia, and finally the selection of the Nationalist leader, Col. Carlos Mendieta as President by the revolutionary junta—Cuba averted civil war and installed a Government sure to receive popular support. The fall of the radical Grau régime followed the return to Havana of Dr. Sterling, Cuba's envoy to Washington, who reported to the Grau Cabinet that there was no hope of recognition by the United States Government. The appointment of Carlos Hevia as his successor was due to the temporary ascendancy of one faction over another. Antonio Guiteras, Secretary of the Interior, War, and Navy, was supporting Carlos Hevia; Colonel Batista, Cuban army head, was urging the election of Colonel Mendieta. The threat of a general strike forced Secretary Guiteras to yield to Colonel Batista's candidate, and Colonel Mendieta took the oath of office on January 18. One of the last acts of the Grau régime was to take over the property of the Cuban Electric Company, an American-owned \$200,000,000 corporation, which had become involved in a bitter labor dispute with its employees. Secretary Guiteras was operating the property pending settlement of the dispute.

**Totalitarian Progress in Italy.**—Premier Mussolini's bill giving official existence to a Corporative State received approval by a great majority in the Senate on January 13. It was expected that the measure would be favorably voted on by the Chamber before the end of the month and that immediate steps would then be taken looking to the reformation of the Italian State, including the



suppression of the Chamber of Deputies. (It will be recalled that last November the Premier denounced the Chamber as anachronistic and foretold its dissolution.) The Senate's vote was preceded by an address from Il Duce in which he outlined the Fascist economic creed. This admits private initiative and private ownership of property, the Premier explained, but private ownership must be regarded as a duty as well as a right. It is a social function. The private owner is bound to develop, increase, and multiply his property, and this not for the sake of individual enjoyment but principally for the common good. In other words, property must be active, not passive. The Premier announced in conclusion that the Government's 4,000,000,000 lire issue of four-per-cent bonds had been greatly oversubscribed.

**Puerto Rico's New Governor.**—The San Juan press reported on January 12 the resignation of Governor Gore and the appointment by President Roosevelt of Major Gen. Blanton Winship as Governor of Puerto Rico. Governor Gore's resignation was not unexpected, both because of his poor health, and because of a series of political events which were thought to have made his position virtually untenable. General Winship is a native of Macon, Ga., and began his military career in 1898, serving through the Spanish-American War, the Filipino Insurrection, and with the army of Cuban pacification. He was also with General Funston at Vera Cruz in 1914, and in the World War was staff officer and Judge Advocate of the Forty-third division.

**Socialism in Germany.**—On January 16, Chancellor Hitler published the new German labor code, to become effective on May 1. Its aim was the organization of national labor, and effected fundamentally the social and economic rights and duties between employers and employees. At one stroke organized labor was despoiled of all its rights and privileges so that labor unions, with the right to organize and to carry on collective bargaining, and the union's only means of self-defense, the strike, were made illegal. The matter of wages was placed in the hands of the employer, who is called the "leader." While the employees or "followers" must submit to the working conditions prescribed by the leader or make an appeal to the State for investigation and adjustment, "Social Honor Courts" will be set up to try the cases of employers accused of maliciously exploiting labor. The principle of social honor was supposed to regulate the principle of leadership in business. It was reported that Premier Goering ordered the dissolution of the three Masonic Grand Lodges in Prussia on the ground that national unification would be better served without secret groupings of individuals. An American citizen, Max Schussler, was for the second time cruelly beaten by a Nazi trooper. The body of Van der Lubbe was buried quietly without rites at Leipzig on January 15. The body was refused to relatives in Holland. The forty-first birthday of General Goering, Premier of Prussia, was celebrated on January 12 with national rejoicing. Minister of Propaganda

Goebbels called upon German export firms to discharge Jewish representatives abroad, demanding that these be replaced by Aryans. It was reported that the homes of many Lutheran ministers, particularly officials of the Pastors' Emergency Federation, were raided by Nazi police. It was reported that Reichbishop Mueller had called upon the State to intervene in the bitter fight of the conservative Lutheran clergy, numbering 6,000 and backed by over 1,500,000 laymen against his dictatorial control. All members of the first and second Church Cabinets handed in their resignations.

**French Press, Exports, Finances.**—Shortly after the street rioting that accompanied the Chamber's debate upon the Stavisky affair, the newspapers offered evidence showing that the Duc de Guise, Pretender to the French throne, had given his approval to the Royalist demonstration. It was said that the Royalists had planned to flood the capital with handbills urging the immediate establishment of a Directorate in the event that the Government failed to survive the interpellations of the Opposition. Premier Chautemps, however, came off victorious in his battle, the Chamber rejecting, 360 to 229, the proposal for a parliamentary commission to investigate the Bayonne pawnshop scandal and later by an even larger majority voting confidence in the Premier. On the next day the Government introduced a bill to facilitate the repression of dishonesty among officials and of blackmail and libel by the press. But the newspapers immediately protested against the latter half of the bill. While wholeheartedly approving the Government's intentions, the newspapers believed that the provisions of the bill might too easily be used as a restriction upon freedom of the press. This opposition was so strong and arose from so many quarters, including even the pro-Government organs, that drastic amendments were predicted for the press section of the Premier's bill. The recent sharp restrictions imposed by Germany upon the entrance of French goods aroused threats of immediate reprisals in Paris. The French Ministry of Commerce refused to acknowledge or accept the German measures, and Ambassador François-Poncet was ordered to convey this information to the Berlin Government. Germany, however, refused to modify her new stand; as a consequence, it was expected that the Quai d'Orsay would soon denounce the 1927 trade treaty, further reduce the import quotas upon German goods, and impose additional surtaxes upon them. In the meanwhile it was stated by prominent authorities that the new American monetary measures would not cause France to devalue the franc. Officials freely admitted that the imminent operations of the British and the new American Equalization Funds would probably result in a serious drain upon French gold; they admitted, too, that the number of tourists would in all likelihood be considerably smaller during 1934, and that the unfavorable trade balance would probably increase. However, they felt these unpleasant prospects to be far less serious than a devaluation of the franc, and they insisted that the Government was not even considering devaluation.

**Dollfuss Curbs Nazis.**—Violence continued throughout Austria, the Government's proclamation on January 12 listing 140 major outrages in which life and property had been endangered by bombings during one week from January 1 to 8. There were innumerable other less serious disturbances. Chancellor Dollfuss acted with a dictator's power under an emergency which necessitated martial law in Vienna. He abandoned his former conciliatory policy and was determined to crush with a strong arm the ever-growing Nazi insurrection. Fifty Nazis were arrested in Villach, Carinthia, and ten near Innsbruck, and sent to concentration camps. One man, Peter Strauss, was convicted of arson and hanged, the first instance of revival of capital punishment in Austria since the Republic. A Nazi leader named Grebe was sent to a concentration camp at Woellersdorff, where many other prominent Nazis were imprisoned. Count Waldeck-Pyrmont of Germany, discovered with Austrian Nazis, was deported. Rumors of breaks in the Heimwehr created much excitement. Count Alberti, Commander of the lower Austrian Heimwehr, was discovered in conference with Alfred Trauenfeld, Vienna Nazi leader, for which he was relieved of his command. Something of a victory for Prince von Starhemberg occurred on January 11 when at a conference of the Fascist leaders the Government announced that the complete control of the police and the army would be placed under Vice-Chancellor Fey, Heimwehr leader. Catholic priests were warned by their Bishops to abstain from all political activity during the present civil strife.

**Saar Plebiscite.**—With a population predominantly Catholic, containing also a fair proportion of Socialists and Communists, the Saar region, now governed by a League of Nations commission under the treaty of Versailles, presented a serious problem as discussions proceeded concerning the plebiscite provided for 1935 by the treaty. This plebiscite would decide whether the region would go to France or to Germany or else remain under the League of Nations. Germany, by the treaty, has the right to repurchase the valuable coal mines handed over to the French in compensation for German mine destruction during the World War. At the League Council's opening session on January 15, a proposal was made by the French delegate to invite Germany to attend the Council's discussion later in the week for the Saar plebiscite. The French also proposed a draft convention to prevent inciting to war by radio. Germany sent her reply to the French discussion proposal on the following day, but its contents were not made public. At the same time, reports and petitions were submitted to the Council. These were: (1) complaints from the Saar advisory council and Saar chamber of commerce against G. G. Knox, the British chairman of the Saar's governing commission, accusing him of partiality; (2) the commission's reply to the same claiming that the Nazis were usurping political authority and resorting to extremist measures; (3) a joint petition of the Saar League of Workers and the Economic League charging that the Nazis were exerting intolerable pressure, inciting to violence, threatening reprisals in the future,

etc. The Council replied by reappointing the commission, including its chairman, G. G. Knox. Reports from Paris varied as to a proposal which the Germans were said to have made to France: whether they had suggested that the plebiscite be anticipated a year or that it be done away with altogether; in either case in return for great material advantages which would come to France at the German repurchase of the coal mines. Many Catholic pilgrims from the Saar attended the exposition of the Holy Coat of the Saviour in Trier, Germany, last summer.

**Disastrous Flood in Argentina.**—More than fifty persons were killed, hundreds injured, and a property loss of \$8,000,000 was caused by a flood in the Mendoza Province of Argentina. The flood resulted from the melting of snows and glaciers on the slopes of Tupungato Volcano. For weeks Argentina had been sweltering under a record-breaking heat spell. Miles upon miles of lofty peaks poured a tremendous volume of water into the Mendoza River faster than the gorge could take it. The water rose until it became a torrent, wiping out whole villages and millions of acres of vineyards. With telephone and telegraph wires down and highways and railways completely washed out for long stretches, the only available rapid-transport service between Chile and Argentina was the tri-weekly service of the Pan-American-Grace Airways.

**Nanking Forces Take Foochow.**—Foochow, the capital of the rebellious Fukien Province, surrendered to the Nanking forces January 13. The city was entered by Nationalist marines while the famous Nineteenth Army, the mainstay of the rebels, without fighting, withdrew towards Changchow. Fearing disorder would attend the evacuation, American marines landed from the U. S. S. Tulsa at the request of Vice-Consul Burke in charge of the United States Consular district. A Japanese warship also landed 150 marines to protect citizens of Formosa, a large number of whom inhabit the fallen city. A new civil war broke out during the week in Northwest China and serious fighting was reported along the frontiers of Ninghsia, a province being invaded by General Sun's army of 50,000 troops.

At the recent birth-control hearing this magazine was represented as an observer by Joseph F. Thorning. He will report what he saw and heard next week.

What a chaplain does in a forest camp of the Civilian Conservation Corps will be narrated next week by Thomas J. Malone in "Chaplain of the CCC."

February 2 will be the feast of Our Lady's Purification—Candlemas Day. Its meaning and history will be told by Francis P. LeBuffe in an article next week.

The triumphs and failures of modern poetry will be set forth by Malcolm L. Stewart in "The Modern Poetry."